

## Fall 2002 Scoping

SBNMSPLAN and Website comments

### **Over 16,000 hits from ED action alert**

SNMS receives less protection than it needs and fails to meet National Program mission to protect living marine resources

Effects of fishing activities, pollution, vessel traffic threaten the well being of habitat and marine wildlife

Compelling scientific evidence supports the establishment of no take marine reserves and provide undisturbed research areas

Regulations are required to protect whales from private and commercial vessels,  
to provide safe speed zones in high use areas,

safe viewing distances, limit the number of vessels in proximity to whales

Sanctuary boundaries must be expanded to include habitat critical to well-being of marine wildlife such as Jeffreys Ledge

Sanctuary must become a no discharge zone for all vessels

Perform research to create scientifically based no take marine reserve w/in SBNMS

### **Michele D'Addio, North Haven, CT (plus 500 from SBNMSPlan action alert sponsor??)**

Strengthen the existing management plan to ensure it achieves its primary purpose to protect SBNMS

The existing management plan fails to regulate most commercial activities affecting the marine resources within Stellwagen even those that are known to be damaging

Threats to the Sanctuary's resources include:

certain destructive fishing practices,

shipping traffic, and

wastewater discharges from the greater Boston area.

The new management plan should include measures to significantly reduce these threats.

Initiate discussions about establishing fully protected marine areas within the Sanctuary boundaries.

### **Working Assets Action Alert**

#### **Dianne Schulte, Blue Oceans, Portsmouth NH.**

Assess destruction of seafloor from fishing gear and regulate this more strictly than existing regs.

Assess impacts of MWRA: concerned about influx of fresh, sterile water

Expand boundaries to include Jeffreys Ledge as it is an alternate feeding grd for large whales

Better regulate whale watching

Increase outreach to marinas etc regarding whale watching

Increase enforcement

#### **Jen Hafner, Director, Blue Oceans, Portsmouth NH**

Human impacts on Marmam

Enforce existing WW guidelines to limit adverse impacts from humans

Provide outreach to all boaters regarding guidelines and whale watching protocols

Limit vessel speed in the sanctuary to at least below 20 knots for all vessels

Boundary expansion

Marmam use both banks for feeding habitat sometimes using both habitats within the same day  
Jeffreys is an important herring spawning ground  
Herring are an important commercial and prey species

#### Impacts of fishing

Study the effects of fishing on the sanctuary including:

- ghost gear,

  - Should be monitored and engage in a clean up such as IFAW / MADMF project of a few years ago

- bottom habitat,

  - sanctuary should be protected from gear that tears up the bottom

- large midwater trawlers

  - these vessels are competing with marmam for food

  - they fish in close proximity to marmam

#### Outreach efforts

- Expand and fully fund outreach efforts

- Website needs significant attention – currently unusable

- Create a “friends of the Sanctuary” group

#### Marine debris and water pollution

- Provide better education and outreach on this issue

- Create a marine debris information page on the website

- Develop a boater / marina education program

#### A Sanctuary should look like a sanctuary

- There must be some limitations, some difference you encounter when you cross into SBNMS

- Reduced speed, traffic, greater enforcement,

- Otherwise who are you?

#### Vito Giacolone, Gloucester

- Would like to see the “compelling evidence” that supports ongoing “destruction of marine habitat” in SBNMS

- Commercial fishing industry is heavily regulated. Much of SBNMS is closed for 6 months of the year

- Sanctuary encompasses almost all of the vital fishing grounds for small boat fishermen

- Industry was supportive of designation due to needs for protection from dumping, drilling, dredging pollution

- Original DEIS exempts traditional fishing

- Fishing in general would be through NMFS NEFMC

- SBNMS must be mindful of importance of the area to fishing communities

- Make decisions on solid information and include stakeholders

- Allow studies on impacts to reach conclusions before acting

  - how much of SBNMS is actually towed or towable.

  - Clear cutting is a false analogy to towing activity

- There is no indication that there are negative effects on fish populations from bottom trawling

**Alexandra West, Vineyard Haven, MA**

Honor the Sanctuary's mission of conserving protecting and enhancing biodiversity, ecological integrity and cultural legacy by adopting strict new protective regulations  
Recognize US Comm. on Ocean Policy report that the oceans health is in jeopardy  
Regulations must be used to ensure human uses and associated pollution do not continue to threaten health of Sanctuary  
Safeguard against detrimental impacts of commercial and recreational fishing and boating, commercial shipping traffic, wastewater discharges from vessels and Boston area, whale watching activities, laying of cables  
Create scientifically based network of fully protected no take marine reserves within SBNMS  
Expand boundary to include Jeffreys Ledge  
Do not miss this opportunity to ensure the sanctuary lives up to its name

**David Marciano, Beverly, MA**

Effects of fishing activities, pollution, and vessel traffic have shown no negative impact to the Sanctuary  
Sanctuary already receives protection from the harvesters of the resource who have intimate knowledge of the effects of fishing  
Sanctuary is currently thriving, fish stocks are recovering (see NEFMC web page)  
Theses harvesters give access to the consuming public and are leaders in the world as far as responsible fishing  
No other measures need to be implemented as current fisheries management process addresses all the ecological and biological diversity in Gulf of Maine

**Susan Klem, Lincoln, MA**

Assure fishing is done in a responsible and sustainable way including fish caught and damage to the bottom  
Control the number of fishing boats, whale watch boats and pleasure craft

**Catherine Mygatt, Middlebury VT**

Eliminate dragging on the seafloor to protect bottom inhabitants and prey species  
At least part of the sanctuary should be off limits to all fishing  
Reduce boat traffic in SBNMS to protect whales  
Shipping, boat speeds, discharge of wastes should all be regulated within SBNMS

**George Amarantides, Epping NH**

Do not expand current boundaries of SBNMS, plenty of closed areas already to protect biomass  
Concentrate on air quality  
Address midwater trawl issue before herring stocks are wiped out

**Raymond Green**

Provide effective management of natural and wildlife resources  
Recreational anglers are regularly advocates for the environment  
If scientifically proven effective to avoid damage by rec fishers, they would support bag limits, seasonal closures, etc  
If boundary expansion is for the purpose of prevent drilling, preventing waste disposal, improve water quality, preventing alteration of seafloor, then perhaps there are merits  
Not in support of blanket closures and full ban on recreational fishing

**Patricia Brueschke, Chicago, IL**

Decrease speed of boats in SBNMS for all classes of boats to protect marmam  
Protect seafloor by keeping WGoM closed  
Sanctuary must have control of the effects of human activity on the seafloor  
Continue research into impacts on bottom in trawled and non trawled areas  
Expand the boundary to include all of Jeffery's Ledge  
Vulnerable to the same threats from heavy human use as SB  
Important spawning habitat for herring, a key prey species  
Jeffreys in important fall feeding area for right whales

**Heidi Nichols, MA**

Do not allow alteration of seafloor  
Reduce or eliminate harvesting of marine animals in sanctuary; at least part of SBNMS should be off limits to all fishing  
Reduce boat traffic in SBNMS  
Restrict shipping, speed, discharge of waste water

**Melanie Pearson, UMASS**

Do not close SBNMS to the fishing community or recreational boaters

**Naomi Nelson, Winchester, MA**

Expand boundary to include Jeffreys as an alternate habitat for Marmam  
Decrease boat speeds to avoid ship strikes of marmam  
Keep the seafloor in tact to assure a healthy food chain

**Melanie Mahin, Arlington, MA**

Expand boundary to include Jeffreys as an alternate habitat for Marmam and as it is important herring spawning area  
Decrease boat speeds to avoid ship strikes of marmam  
Keep the seafloor in tact to protect recovering groundfish populations and to protect the seafloor ecosystem

**Nancy Rackham, Pittsburgh PA**

Expand boundary to include Jeffreys as an alternate habitat for Marmam and as it is important herring spawning area

Decrease boat speeds to avoid ship strikes of marmam

Keep the seafloor in tact to protect recovering groundfish populations and to protect the seafloor ecosystem

Increase enforcement of SBNMS regs particularly around marmam

Increase public education and outreach, particularly with boaters

**Just Moller, Ipswich, MA**

SBNMS receives much less protection than it needs and fails to meet National Program missions

Strong new management measures must be implemented to better clarify sanctuaries role in preserving habitat, restoring declining fish stocks, and protecting endangered species.

Regulatory measures must be refined or developed and implemented to ensure SBNMS has to have the authority to carry out its mission

This must include a review of fed and state authority over sanctuary waters

Current conflicts between missions and jurisdictions makes effective management difficult if not impossible

Missions need to work in concert

Regulations are needed to protect whales from private and commercial whale watching

Provide safe speed zones in high use areas, provide safe viewing distances, and limit the numbers of boats in close proximity to whales.

Expand boundary to include Jeffreys Ledge

Make SBNMS a no discharge zone for all vessels

Perform serious study towards the possibility of creating a scientifically based no take marine reserve

**Pearl Lang, MA**

Expand boundary to include Jeffreys as an alternate habitat for Marmam and as it is important herring spawning area

Decrease boat speeds to avoid ship strikes of marmam

Keep the seafloor in tact to protect recovering groundfish populations and to protect the seafloor ecosystem

**John Savlove, N Bennington, VT**

Recognize vital connection between sustainable economy, world governance, and policies sensitive to global envt

West has historically been too good at exploiting forces of nature and natural resources

We must learn how to allow natural systems to flourish and fit within natural cycles rather than try to control them

SBNMS should be a leader in developing new ocean management policies that place humans within the system rather than managing for how much we can take out of the system.

**Clarissa Baut, Phila, PA**

Excessive fishing should be banned at least from designated areas to allow ecosystems to flourish

**Yvonne Oppenheim**

If unable to outright ban all fishing from sanctuaries then at least limit it to non destructive and sustainable activities,

Typically we wait too long before we regulate and we need not wait if there appears to be a problem, we should act on best available information and be conservative in our actions in favor of conservation

Protect marine mammals from shipping impacts and tourism harassment

The sanctuary belongs to all of us not just commercial interests

Sanctuary management needs to recognize its responsibility for that

**John Williamson, Kennebunk, ME**

SBNMS should perform a comprehensive assessment of marine ecological function within Sanctuary and in areas proximate to or with close ecological relationship to SBNMS

Assessment should consider

- Trophic structure

- Species relationships

- Species annual distribution patterns

- Species age class structures

- Habitat characteristics

- Susceptibility to disturbance

- Vulnerability of benthic communities

SBNMS should redefine its boundaries to capture as a consistent “whole” that set of conditions to which it can best apply a rigorous management approach

This approach should include a system of marine zoning to place levels of protection consistent with vulnerability of species or ecology in specific areas

This should be done in concert with NEFMC and NMFS

**Robert Parsons,**

Do not close bank to fishing

Whale watching should be maintained as it is an important educational tool

**Chris Nolan,**

Ban all drag net fishing as it is destructive to the seafloor

**Jeff Gorczyca, NJ**

Please keep SBNMS open to recreational fishermen

**Lawrence Thomases, Medford, MA**

Provide safeguards against destructive trawling, ocean waste dumping, and assure that harmful practices which diminish the ecosystem do not occur within SBNMS

**Abigail Henrich, E. Walpole, MA**

Fully protect ocean and wildlife habitats within SBNMS

**Amanda Kozuck, NOAA**

Mandatory ship reporting for vessels entering SBNMS to provide boaters with info on marmam species present in the area and how to behave around them

Also put in place speed restrictions on all vessels

**Stewart Fefer, USFWS, Falmouth, ME**

Address lack of knowledge of seabird use of SBNMS

Research abundance, trends and distribution

Perform a demonstration project to assist in GoM wide monitoring of seabirds

SBNMS, as a specially designated conservation area, should take the initiative to forward our knowledge base regarding seabird use of habitats

Implement a seabird monitoring program on SBNMS

**Bill, [vze2mpjg@verizon.net](mailto:vze2mpjg@verizon.net)**

Do not allow waste disposal within 12 mile radius of SBNMS

Ban the laying of fibre optic cables in SBNMS

**Martha Meadows, Chester Springs, PA**

Implement a speed limit in SBNMS to avoid vessel impacts on marmam

**Elizabeth Bradley, Miami, FL**

Implement a speed limit in SBNMS to avoid vessel impacts on marmam

**Ann Seip, Bensalem, PA**

Pay stronger attention to interactions between humans and whales

Restrict how close vessels approach

Limit number of boats within certain distance of whales

Address the problem of entanglement of whales in fishing gear

Do all possible to eliminate risk of oil spill that could damage whales

Restrict speeds around whales

**Richard Vincunas, [Rrvdvm@aol.com](mailto:Rrvdvm@aol.com)**

Clarify definition of conservation

Wise use of resource v. preservation which is no use

Do not ban recreational fishing from SBNMS

Assess economic impacts of this course of action

Developing an MPA is not a responsible alternative to fishing conservation measures such as length, gear and bag restrictions

**Tom Richardson., Mattapoisett MA**

Keep SBNMS open to all forms of recreational rod and reel fishing

**Gary George, Peabody, MA**

Fully opposed to all closures of public resources to the public  
SBNMS should not be closed to recreational fishing nor whale watching  
Stellwagen bank is the only realistic fishing ground as a small boat owner

**Aurora Mary Kilai,**

Navy sonar is potentially devastating to marine mammals  
Protecting marine mammals in SBNMS includes protecting them from noise pollution  
Marine mammals are acutely acoustically sensitive  
There have been conclusive links between sonar activity and deaths and strandings of marine mammals  
There has been evidence of significant disruption of communication, migration, breeding and other marine mammal behaviors  
There are many unanswered questions and concerns regarding human induced noise into the ocean and impacts on marine life  
Particularly with the LFAS the navy has been granted an exemption from the MMPA by NMFS to “take” marine mammals during testing of LFAS

**John Odin Jensen, Mystic Seaport, CT**

Sanctuary focuses significant efforts to mitigate adverse impacts of human activity  
Address whale strikes  
Discharge of marine wastes  
Over fishing  
However, not all human activity is negative and SBNMS is a culturally rich area  
Use history of human use of SB to provide positive outreach for cultural heritage of area  
SBNMS should encompass SCR  
SCR provides opportunity to capture public’s imagination and interest  
This can be used to expand on larger message of ocean stewardship and health of Sanctuary  
NOAA has statutory responsibility to preserve SCR under its jurisdiction  
These resources can be used as a means to illustrate historical human dimensions of SBNMS waters  
SBNMS should develop comprehensive GIS inventory of cultural resources and an integrated program of archeological and historical research  
Decode human maritime cultural landscape in SBNMS



**Les Kaufman, BU, Boston, MA**

SBNMS is sanctuary in name only

There is need for a true marine sanctuary for:

- Ensure the protection of marine wildlife and wilderness
- to provide a baseline against which the efficacy of resource management can be assessed,
- to provide a mechanism for rebuilding overfished stocks,
- to ensure that overfishing does not occur again.

Can this SBNMS MPR change this fact?

The relative risks to the sanctuary have not been assessed and prioritized.

Had this been done, fishing impacts, as well as the long-term impacts on fishers of centuries of lousy management, would both have been dealt with explicitly.

Opportunity exists to set up a controlled experiment in resource management by closing off one third to one half of the Sanctuary to all extractive activities, both commercial and recreational, and leaving the remainder open.

Under these circumstances, it would at least become feasible to conduct comparative research on the open and closed areas, and thus to be able to separate human activities from other natural influences on resource distribution and abundance.

Without a clear designation of impacted and unimpacted (or at least less impacted) areas, there is positively no management accountability, and the entire exercise of managing human impacts becomes one of meaninglessness and futility.

The cost of this must be considered part of the essential budget for SBNMS, though the work itself may be either conducted by Sanctuary staff or let out via competitive or collaborative proposals by area academic institutions.

Unfortunately, to judge from NOAA's sudden-death budget process each year, Congress is blissfully unaware of this need. No small part of this may be attributable to the way that powerful interests that run the New England Fishery Management Council jerk NMFS, NMS, and the rest of NOAA around.

In sum, there are pressing political, scientific, conservation, and other public interest concerns that threaten to be appreciated and dealt with fairly under the existing process.

A good first step would be the establishment of a Stellwagen Bank Totally Protected Area- in perpetuity. Controversial, perhaps. Doing the right thing so often is.

**Christine Bogdanowicz, Shoals Marine Laboratory, NH**

I am a firm believer in the establishment of Marine Sanctuaries

Stellwagen is a special place and should be protected as such into perpetuity.

It is imperative as stewards of our planet to preserve such biodiverse and unique ocean spaces.

**Wendy Lawton, Rockport, MA 01966", "Pingree School"**

Assist with curriculum development on issues affecting SBNMS

**Jan Smith Mass Bays Program Boston MA**

Develop inventory of habitat types including an inventory of characteristic species. Develop some measure of ecosystem health based on community composition.

This will also help to evaluate potential large scale impacts such as global warming and invasive species.

Consideration should be given to protecting large animals such as basking sharks, mola-molas and others in addition to marine mammals, since these megafauna suffer from some of the same impacts from human activities and may merit protection.

Partnerships with other agencies with ongoing monitoring efforts are likely to help further the goals related to water quality.

Desired actions for the Sanctuary may likely be accomplished through these partnerships with relatively little expenditure of SBNMS resources but could still meet your needs.

Estimated costs in funds and for staff time should be included as part of the final draft plan for each of the possible actions.

### **Bill & Marilyn Voorhies**

As it stands now, the Sanctuary provides little protection within its boundaries.

We firmly believe that Stellwagen Bank must continue its role as an important habitat for a wide variety of marine life, which includes more than a dozen species of whales and dolphins, such as endangered humpback, northern right, sei and fin whales, and Atlantic white-sided dolphins, seabirds and sea turtles, bluefin tuna and cod

SBNMS must manage whale-watching boats, commercial and recreational fishing activity, shipping from the Boston channel, and discharges from the Boston Harbor sewage outfall

Protection of Stellwagen Bank must be substantially increased during this review period so human impacts to avoid putting these and other treasures at increased risk, from which they would be hard pressed to recover.

Measures must be taken to preserve this treasure, sooner rather than later!

### **Carle Brown**

The ocean habitats that the sanctuary encompass are vitally important to New England's culture and history. Most New Englanders feel very passionately about our ocean and marine habitats and wish to see them well managed and protected.

Stellwagen Bank Sanctuary could be an example to other stressed ocean environments if managed properly

### **Annette Lorraine**

I care about Stellwagen and want you to protect it. I would like to see the Sanctuary do the following:

1. Establish no-take marine reserves in the Sanctuary to provide valuable control sites for scientific research and protection for marine biodiversity.
2. Implement enforceable regulations regulating vessel speed and conduct to protect whales within Sanctuary boundaries.
3. Expand the Sanctuary's boundaries to include all instead of just part of Jeffrey's Ledge.
4. Monitor water quality standards and effects on the marine ecosystem within the Sanctuary.

5. Protect cultural resources such as the shipwreck of the "Portland" from ALL disturbance.
6. Expand education and outreach efforts.
7. Increase the Sanctuary's research capabilities.
8. Increase the Sanctuary's enforcement capabilities.

**Gregg Morris, Manomet Ma,**

At designation fishermen supported SBNMS as they believed there would be no restriction on fishing access

Do not violate that promise

There is no evidence fishing is damaging to the environment

SBNMS is the only real access to fishing grounds for small boats

Allow folks (Rec + Comm) to harvest fish in a sustainable way (like present mesh size, hook size, etc).

**Cynthia Bainton**

Sanctuaries are places that provide protection.

Address the deaths of marine creatures through entanglement, boat collisions, and pollution

Sanctuary should increase efforts to control pollution, limit speeds in shipping lanes, and make commercial fishing gear less wasteful.

Enforcement of regulation violations is imperative.

Continue efforts to educate the public about SBNMS existence and hope these efforts will grow to reach more people.

**Cynthia Franklin, Provincetown MA**

Sanctuary is not a sanctuary and visitors to the visitors center are shocked to learn that

Sanctuary staff should err on the side of protecting the resources of the Sanctuary.

Water quality issues are paramount.

Monitor the Boston outfall should be closely monitored for nitrogen signatures, and for the deposition and dispersal of toxics.

Effects of the Mass Bay Disposal Site should also be monitored.

Contingency plans should be in place should either site show an impact on Sanctuary waters and marine life.

Sanctuary waters should be a no dumping zone;

Effects of atmospheric depositions should be studied.

Habitat protection is another critical concern.

Research efforts should be targeted to identifying and setting aside areas for protection of benthic invertebrates.

Education and outreach should be increased.

The Sanctuary dropped off the public radar screen shortly after its designation.

Develop a constituency for the continued protection of the Sanctuary's resources.

**Paul Diggins, Brookline,**

---

Leave the bank open for all to enjoy

**Peter Auster, Groton, CT**

There are several issues that SBNMS should address within the MPR process that may require promulgation of regulations in order to meet the legislative mandate of resource protection within the site:

1. Use of the diversity of literature on fishing effects to determine if such effects are likely to occur at SBNMS. If so, develop alternatives for marine reserves within SBNMS such that all habitats (as proxies for communities of organisms) are represented.
2. Evaluate bycatch of seabirds and marine mammals within the site due to fishing activities (past, present, and predicted into the future). Answer the question: is the level of bycatch consistent with the primary role of the sanctuary?
3. Evaluate the effects of vessel traffic on ship strikes of baleen whales. Are regulations required for vessel speeds to reduce probability of strikes on endangered species?

While the site is designated for human use activities, such activities must constantly be evaluated against the primary purpose of resource protection. Threshold values (quantitative values or qualitative states) for a variety of metrics that serve as proxies for the status of habitats and organisms within the site should be developed such that clear actions are required when threshold values are reached.

**Laurie Savoy**

The amount of whale watch tours to Stellwagen Bank should be limited in the future  
There should be no dumping in SBNMS

**James Constantine, Fall River, MA**

SBNMS should formulate regulations to protect to Stellwagen Bank ocean floor.  
Minimize the damage to the habitat by trawls and dredges to ensure the proper benthic environment  
Regulate the design of fishing equipment to reduce the number of entanglement events that occur each year. Create controls on boats (commercial and private) engaged in whale watching to ensure the animals aren't stressed.

**Anne Hayden, ME**

SBNMS should provide greater protection for living marine resources, both within and outside of the sanctuary boundaries.

Greater restrictions on whale watching boats will provide much needed protection from human interference. Establishment of a no take reserve is also important.

Creating a refuge from fishing activity will protect fish stocks within the sanctuary but also establish a source of recruitment for commercial, recreational and other stocks throughout the Gulf of Maine.

Expanding the sanctuary's boundaries to Jeffrey's Ledge would dramatically increase its value as a MPA

A refuge would also provide a much needed research site for analyzing the effects of various fisheries practices.

**Cynde Bierman, Gloucester, MA**

**Whale watching:**

Captains should have to receive an endorsement from the Coast Guard or the sanctuary to run whale watch boats.

Develop a naturalist certification program and provide them with tools to help impart that message.

The sanctuary could certify companies that have both trained captains and naturalists

Develop a permitting system so that no more boats are allowed to be watching whales.

Assess impact is of vessel noise on animals and provide an incentive for quieter, non polluting

boats

**Fishing:**

How can you call yourself a sanctuary and allow fishing?

Actively work to eliminate marine mammal entanglements in fishing gear

Especially focus on humpbacks, minke and fins as they face the same issues as right whales but don't get the same effort

**Sanctuary Boundaries:**

Enlarge to include all of Jeffreys Ledge.

Right whales have been observed there in the fall.

When sand eels are scarce on Stellwagen, the whales seem to move to Jeffreys, where herring is an important food source.

Fishing for herring should be outlawed.

**Education and Outreach**

The sanctuary should become a formal clearing house of information for naturalists, the general public, research groups, etc.

create a database of ongoing projects on all aspects of activities in SBNMS

Get the interested public involved.

Be more communicative and effective in accepting volunteer contributions

**Angela Sanfilippo, Gloucester Fishermens Wives, Gloucester, MA**

We oppose expanding the Sanctuaries current geographical boundaries.

The majority of the Sanctuary must remain open to commercial fishermen of all gear types and recreational fishing.

The Sanctuary already contains sufficient closed areas for comparative research purposes.

The State of the Sanctuary report should be revised to reflect environmental trends (both positive and negative) over the past decade.

The Sanctuary managers should state clearly what problems have been unresolved under the current management system.

The costs associated with managing the Sanctuary should be made public.

Current prohibitions against industrial development including drilling, dumping, sand and gravel mining, dredging, pipelines and erection of permanent structures must be continued and strengthened.

**Robert Stevenson, UMASS Boston, Boston, MA**

Clarify Sanctuary mandate and program:

NMSA says that conservation is the major purpose and that use must be compatible with that priority.

The job of the management structure is to follow the NMSA

The act states the priority is conservation with use allowed to the extent compatible with that priority

Currently the site functions as a multiple use site. This is not what the NMSA mandates.

What is the desired future state of SBNMS?

What are measurable outcomes for evaluating progress towards desired state?

Should SBNMS be more managed more like a National Forest, National Monument or a National Park?

What is the National Marine Sanctuary Program and what is the Stellwagen Bank NMS Mandate?

What is the Sanctuary part of the program?

What is the SBNMS conserving / managing?

Clarify the administrative capacity of the site to perform obligations

What is the purpose of the NMSP when a sanctuary is not remotely a sanctuary, nor managed for maintaining healthy ecosystem function?

Does SBNMS know how to manage per ecosystem based management?

Is the SBNMS clear in what the program mandate is?

Is there clear statutory language to perform this mandate?

Is there a national commitment to ecosystem based management strategies?

Votes will drive review of environmental laws rather than the best approach to problem solving.

Can SBNMS function in a precautionary way?

Precautionary management concerns process and commitment to problem solving rather than dictating an outcome. In face of scientific uncertainty it promotes difficult but open, flexible approach to decision making so long as the long term goal is clear.

If the site is not going to invest in changes of management method then there is no function of the sanctuary that is not redundant.

Clarify Agency Roles: clarify intra and interagency roles (such as within NOAA).

How does SBNMS avoid spreading itself too thin into areas already covered by another entity or agency?

If the role of the site is not clear then the site is expensive and redundant

Provide a comprehensive presentation of overlapping jurisdictions and agency responsibilities identify conflicts that require clarification

Concerned about decision making and open government process.

Putting all the information and decision processes in the public domain i.e. on the web would lead to transparency that is very powerful for the constituencies.

Making visible and objective, administrative decisions regarding budget expenditures and bidding for contracts sends a very powerful message about results.

Clarify Sanctuary Identity:

What makes the sanctuary different?

It has an arbitrary boundary and does not really encompass an ecosystem.

The current way of managing the site is redundant with other agency actions

Only value in the site existence and money spent by the site is to champion ecosystem based management and the integrity of the ecosystem but does it do this?

If management is not going to invest in planning for changes in management style towards an integrated approach then there is no real function for the existence of the site.

All activities must be integrated with ecosystem impacts and integration in mind.

Value to the sanctuary is to change the status quo management methods

The value in the size of the site is the possibility to test some of the systems management due to the scale of the study area and to test new management methods.

What is cutting edge about Stellwagen?

The only real management value of the sanctuary is in managing human activity or taking a leadership role in forwarding integrated ecosystem management concepts

How can the sanctuary contribute to changes in the status quo behavior of ocean uses and

attitudes

market incentives for sustainable catch; educating on stewardship concepts; etc

To assure best successes in maintaining a healthy system then management must operate in a risk-adverse manner, in face of scientific uncertainty, errors must be made on the side of environmental protection.

Users must be the ones who show they are not creating an adverse impact before they can engage in their activity.

Assure integrated strategies between site programs as staff too small for compartmentalization all programs require interface and integration / avoid linear thinking in planning

Avoid arrogance by managers who consider themselves "the professionals".

Its clear from council process and most ocean resources law that the concept of ecosystem management is not well understood.

Managers should be aggressive at including multiple opinions and insights.

To assure perception of "objective" data then there must be a combination of internal information and visible collaboration.

Assure peer review of work being used to make decisions

Sanctuary program has not historically shown strong leadership in conservation or ecosystem based management so the "we are the professionals" rings hollow.

The site must avoid perception of closed door thinking and using only internal information for decisions.

NMSP describes itself as cutting edge

..but that's so only in those sites with high political visibility and significant budgets.

NMSP needs to be tending to all sites

Part of change in status quo management is to avoid hypocrisy by having an environmentally sound

facilities plan to be as low impact as possible through "sustainable administration"

At every opportunity SBNMS must look for the most environmentally responsible means.

Be an example of responsible government (see Cape Cod National Seashore MP)  
The federal government is notoriously behind the times when it comes to innovative change towards acting environmentally responsible.

If SBNMS intends to dictate more responsible behavior for marine activities then they need to show a willingness and commitment to do so at home.

To assure continued support for site, develop performance measures and provide annual publicly visible report on success towards meeting management goals

#### Better Develop knowledge of the Sanctuary:

Invest in site characterization work and research to develop a true State of the Sanctuary report: Document what data exists and in ways to communicate the information such as MA EOEA bio mapping project.

Develop a rigorous site characterization and identify information gaps, modeling and monitoring needs.

Partner with others for whale protection as an example of how to handle management for animals that use a huge range of habitat such as the great whales. (for example create partnership with managers of breeding grounds)

Use the expertise of global and regional research institutions to help inform any gaps in local information.

Compile a case history of the ecosystem including historic information of how human impacts and climate effects have altered the ecosystem through time.

#### Create a science advisory panel to assure regular review of priorities and accountability

Invest heavily in building partnerships

Assure respectful inclusiveness of input from a full range of partnerships

Include community based; grass roots; institutional; academic research and groups

Prepare a visible annual report on progress in meeting goals

Initiate peer review of projects to ensure value of the proposal to a larger plan.

#### Sanctuary Stewardship:

Expand support for ocean stewardship and the concept of sanctuary by creating a creative messaging strategy to advertise a fresh look at why sanctuaries are important places to that you reach multiple audiences.

Avoid the traditional dull bureaucratic marketing

Create an education advisory panel that will help engender spirit of ownership in outreach projects, contribute to curriculum development and integrate with the regional partnerships to enhance visibility of the site.

#### Sanctuary Legal Obligations:

When performing legal obligations such as socio economic studies traditional methods repeat the concept of valuation for extraction.

Relative to a return on investment, traditional economic analysis or paradigms are not effective when evolving towards valuing ecosystem services and functions or new management regimes.

Ecosystem based management suggests there is value in ecosystem component relationships which enhance economic take.



Status quo economic modeling is not complex enough to encompass all appropriate economic systems and parameters such as non-use benefits.

Specific recommendations

1. With radio beacons record all commercial vessels (shipping, whale watch, tour or fishing vessels) that move through the sanctuary waters.
2. Publish these data on the web with summary information about vessel speeds.
3. Develop specific measures of ecosystem health. See William Dennison's Moreton Bay publications <http://www.coastal.crc.org.au/ehmp/publications.html>
4. Develop events to involve the public in a meaning full way: have people sailing out to the fishing grounds  
Demonstrating how people fished!
5. Extend the boundaries of the park to the sea shore in Cap Cod and the North Shore. Build a partnership with the TTOR to have a land-sea sanctuary that surrounds Boston. Create an event in which people make the great tour on land and sea!

Failures:

Management has not dealt with the fishing issue in its many dimensions.

The biological health of the sanctuary is compromised.

As a management team it is your job to ensure the health of the ecosystem for current and future generations.

According to the law the new management plan was due in 1998.

There should have been a plan in 1998 and a revision in 2003.

According to SBNMS website the new plan will be out in 2004 a year later than the second plan should be out.

In most institutions that would be grounds for removing the management team!

**William Scharenweber, MMA, Buzzards Bay, MA**

- Assure effective law enforcement and educational outreach to recreational boaters
- Partner with the Coast Guard to provide aerial enforcement
- Develop a reporting system for witnesses of infractions.

**Maryanne Mills, Lauren Dahill, Angela Abbott, Colleen Walsh, Karissa Tower, Christin Wood, MMA Buzzards Bay, MA**

- conservation of resources pertaining to fishing grounds,
  - significant global evidence of overfishing
  - SBNMS needs to spearhead research on ocean ecosystems and sustainable fisheries management
  - Develop no fishing areas within SBNMS
- the usage of artificial reefs
  - assess the use of artificial reefs in SBNMS to create marine habitat
  - enhances food web by providing areas encouraging growth that are food for fish
  - increases productivity for the use of sports anglers
  - useful as non exploited nursery grounds or marine reserves
  - artificial reefs in SBNMS would be added bonus to ecosystem
- increasing funding for the program,
  - levy a user fee on whale watching boats to increase resources available to SBNMS
  - levy a fee on recreational fishing charter boats and party boats
- the cultural/historical aspects of the areas specifically the SS Portland
  - do not change SCR regs
  - do not turn this into a public dive site
- SBNMS needs to have dedicated enforcement staff to avoid being lost in enforcement activities of partners

**Amy Mortensen, Samantha Wilkin, MMA, Buzzards Bay, MA**

- Better manage whale watching in SBNMS
  - Whale watching has many benefits to society,
    - including increasing scientific knowledge, public education, employment and tourism.
  - Implement whale watching regulations to protect marine mammals from human impacts
    - Reduce speed when approaching whale habitat areas.
    - Control vessel numbers in proximity to whales,

**Carla Shea, Loren Balboni, Jimmy Rosa, Amanda Hallahan, MMA, Buzzards Bay MA**

- Commercial fishing should not be allowed in SBNMS
- Recreational boats, traps, etc. should be limited to designated boundaries within the bank.
- Do not allow party boats to participate in fishing.
- Ban high tech fishing devices.
- Whale watching vessels should all be equipped with prop guards

**Brendan Adams, Joe Laraia, Bridgett Deehan , Paul Fraser, Justin Ballotte, MMA Buzzards Bay, MA**

- More information on how marine mammals use the sanctuary and how their sex, age, and calving history affect populations is needed.

Information on habitat requirements, relationships with other species and human impacts are necessary.  
The "unseen whale" issue must be looked at in order to avoid ship strikes of marine mammals  
Assess entanglement of whales with fishing gear within SBNMS and work to mitigate this.  
Monitor other human activities that generate acoustics and vessel noise  
Asses use of SBNMS for mariculture activities  
Commercial fishing on the bank should be allowed to continue for generations to come.  
If commercial fishing of any type is to be further restricted on the bank, the fishermen should have a say in making the rules.

**Barry Joyce, Brad Simpson, Justen Walker , MMA, Buzzards Bay, MA**

We agree with the 1993 Stellwagen Management Plan's statement on submerged pipelines and cables that "The installation or placement of pipelines and cables within the Sanctuary is prohibited to ensure protection against possible adverse environmental effects on resources, qualities, or habitat areas of the Sanctuary." We feel that this statement is accurate and fully support its purpose.

Without well researched and documented facts on how these aspects would affect the prosperity of the Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary it is our position that the new management plan for 2003 should continue to restrict any pipelines from being laid across the area or in its immediate vicinity.

**Michael Beining, John Muldoon, Scott O'Neil, MMA, Buzzards Bay MA**

Better manage commercial trawl fishing in SBNMS

There should be a permit set out so that limited trawlers can go out and use the zone as fishing grounds.  
Or

Close the site all together and truly create a marine sanctuary and wildlife preserve.

**Josh Conroy, Nathan Darosa, Chris Demas, Courtney Russell, and Kevin Sweet, MMA, Buzzards Bay, MA**

The affects of commercial fishing in the Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary are extremely dramatic and costly to the environment.

**Mark Lynch, Jodi Holewka, Peter Bracken, MMA, Buzzards Bay, MA**

Restrict the number of commercially owned fishing vessels in SBNMS

Promote research on ocean ecosystems and sustainable fisheries management.

Promote legislation that requires sustainable fishing.

Help managers implement existing laws that govern fishing.

Develop process to establish ocean wilderness

For the Stellwagen Bank NMS to be considered a "real" sanctuary strict limits must be placed on what can and can't be done and also the taking of anything from the sanctuary should be either severely limited and regulated or prohibited.

In an effort to research the affects of commercial fishing we propose the permanent closure of specific areas, so that researchers would be able to have a steady control group to be able to study the fish population.

Mystic Scoping meeting 9/24/02

More opportunity for public to get involved

Don't have good grasp what people are doing in Sanctuary

Quantify / clarify human uses

Identify links between human uses and ecology (e.g. trawling)

SBNMS protects very little; astonished by how little the Sanctuary protects

Identify levels of activity (i.e. harvest levels)

Quantify the effects of human use on the ecosystem

Sanctuary should be most restrictive with regard to resource protection; note the difference between FKNMS and SBNMS in terms of destructive fishing practices

Can you equate the concept of NMS to a national park?

The public should know more about the mission statement.

Comparison to a national forest is more accurate.

Most members of the public are unaware of SBNMS

Many thought it was a financial institution

Communicate threats to SBNMS

Publicity is very important

If sanctuary could talk about overfishing, pollution that might give the public something to relate to  
NPR might be a good way to get the word out; public TV; mailings; articles written

Should use technology to reach a broader audience

Should get to youth; this is very important

National campaign, especially to children, the equivalent of "don't be a litterbug" for the ocean

Need launching point for publicity regarding policy and uses of resources

Current Wind energy discussion could draw greater public attention to resource exploitation

NPR, schools, Aq's great ways to let people know how important NMS are

Need to perform better educational outreach:

Create Video and Kids curriculum

Researchers doing work in other countries; how to entice them to do work here in SB?

Outreach to academia to get those people involved.

Host forums for students at universities re: programs occurring at SBNMS / NMS

SBNMS belongs to everyone, people need to know this

People should be proud to protect NMS

Outreach to the Midwest who don't know about Sanctuaries; this is a National Program....  
Identify how / what people think about NMS, how or if appreciate them, who / how uses them?

Need to help public understand threats below the surface

Connect below sea re: food web to use concept to connect people to resources (e.g. extinct cod may affect marine mammals)

No places within SBNMS are protected as "no take"; areas like this should be established

Part of SBNMS could be used as "laboratory"

Should have permanent closed areas not subject to NEFMC

SB needs S.P.A.'s similar to FKNMS

Zoning is a key concept; use in an ecosystem based management approach (holistic approach)

History below the surface (e.g. wrecks) is important; more we can get story out regarding how resources have brought economic pro's to US

Are we looking to attract people to SBNMS?

Publicity may make more people come

Carrying capacity needs to be considered in terms of attracting more visitors

Should use museums to educate people about NMS; what are issues then and now re: management

How do we get people to think about the SBNMS? School forums; ballards work (ring road) series on Natl geo would be good way

Ballard-esque, rather than Ballard

Need forum to talk to visitors about fisheries issues

Partnerships with Aq, museums

Year round education center

Provide opportunity to show / educate public on policies (human interaction and biology of marine ecosystems)

Need to use all available tools such as internet; cd roms to schools; to districts

Have educational video at public aq.; provide handout materials to let them know the Sanct is there.

Need to use "show biz" approach to educate; sophisticated outreach program not standard govtl fare

How to force individual to understand their relationship with policy development;

Ownership is an important concept

Pass out flyers to seek public input

Seek innovative ways to involve public in different ways

There are many ways to involve people – tap into them

“Public” needs to mean general public not just industry (fisher) or users

The oceans are owned by the people in the Midwest just as much as a user (i.e. fisher)

Send synopsis of comments to participants

For the sake of habitat protection there must be “no take” reserves and gear restrictions

For the sake of resource and habitat protection there must be speed limits to avoid affects on whales

- Speeding boats is an issue

- Limit commercial vessels

- Evaluate the impact of sound of commercial vessels on whales

- Identify a carrying capacity to mitigate effects on whales

Increase educational programs and outreach for schools and general public

- Educate on resource protection issues

- How human activities affect the resources

- How identifying something as a resource separates humans from its life history and so makes it easier for us to take too much without being responsible for the effects on the “resource”

Education and outreach programs must link with research facilities, schools, whalewatching industry, aquariums

Issue of boat speed and noise – are there too many boats too loud for marine mammals?

Expand boundaries to include Jeffreys Ledge

- to create buffer area for wildlife and incorporate different whale habitat

- to encompass different habitat than currently contained

Education on whale watching boats in SBNMS (good naturalist training; broad based information; talk of marine mammals in context of ecosystem)

Limit or stop trawling

Control littering and marine debris

Water Quality:

- Monitor Boston Harbor outfall

- Regulate discharge from vessels

- Stop illegal dumping of “trash”

Marine Mammal

- People know about the Sanctuary because of whales

Create enforceable regs on whale watching (currently voluntary guidelines)  
Vessel traffic – create zones and speed limits on all traffic  
Sanctuary should examine whale interaction with fishing gear and consider regulating within the SBNMS

Sanctuary Administration:

- Need proper resources for education and outreach (more staff and \$)
- Need a functional research vessel
- Need enforcement bodies
- Need better infrastructure – more \$ for new office

Education goes with enforcement – people shouldn't claim ignorance

Must function using ecosystem based management (not species by species)

SBNMS should systematically address SCR through broad program if system wide surveying

Provide more public education on the “state of the sanctuary” and sanctuary management  
No one knows SBNMS is there

- Must create measurable objectives to show quantitatively measures of success

Enforcement should come from the Sanctuary not from NMFS; SBNMS should have control of its own enforcement team and should be the one enforcing its own rules

What does a successful Sanctuary look like?

SBNMS needs full monitoring program to determine status of resources

There is currently no framework to guide and use monitoring data  
Data is collected but not consistent; no planning of use, just haphazard collection  
Data collected needs to be available to the public. This is paid for by the public

SBNMS must address the effects of fishing on sanctuary system

Make SBNMS more protected and less “multiple use”

Place more focus on protecting the seabed, groundfish, prey species. Protect gravel habitats

Make sure SBNMS has active coordination with NMFS, Mgmt Council on issues such as herring

NEFMC Must acknowledge that SBNMS is a sanctuary and a “special area”

Sanctuary should be protected and kept natural

Specific protections need to be developed and maintained to protect natural ecosystem  
Identify habitats that require especial protection

Some fishing gear should not be used (e.g. bottom trawls and scallop dredges)

SBNMS research should look at environmental history of the area to use in informing mngmnt

Assess the scope of the problem of bycatch of seabirds, marine mammals and the scope of ship strikes on MarMaM

Develop thresholds of mortality for populations that regulating agencies need to abide by or SBNMS will enforce

No high speed ferries in Sanctuary

SBNMS must assess noise levels and impacts on wildlife

Most important ecological and SCR resources need to be protected. Establish fully protected ecological reserves

Need science to show “no take” reserves are contributing / can contribute to fish stocks

Establish “control” sites (i.e. no take areas) to determine human impacts and to maintain pristine areas

Establish no take reserves to protect biodiversity, not just for fisheries

Use SBNMS as a test area to evaluate species protection / enhancement policies which can be used in other areas

More high level, quality education, public outreach including public meetings, issue specific workshops. Provide follow-up on results of scoping; provide for more public involvement and engagement

Develop partnerships with NGO's; insitutions; universities

Discovery channel episode, etc. to raise public awareness of SBNMS

NMSP needs to raise program awareness with the public

NMSP needs to decide what it wants to be.

NMSP message should be conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity

SBNMS has a bias towards advertising whales as their charismatic mega fauna; cod sitting on the bottom are as important

SBNMS needs to incorporate concept of preserving cultural integrity and link to marine reserves

Coastal towns and culture linked to marine resources communicate what your cultural link to ocean is....marine resources



Long term preservation of healthy ecosystem is important for constituents

If no fish – no fishermen

Partner with state to link state sanctuary with federal sanctuary

Coastal areas are not directly linked with us but there is still an interrelationship that needs to be acknowledged

New Bedford Scoping Meeting 9/25/02

Concerned with conservation in GoM - Needs real protection;  
sanctuary is not providing that nor protection needed for SBNMS  
Want to see increased protection

SBNMS is not a real Sanctuary  
New Zealand is miles ahead of US in marine resource protection and use of reserves  
Can / should be used to help fishermen as well as protect biodiversity

SBNMS has no name recognition  
Revisit the voyage of the Mimi (1980)  
Do a Mimi II with Ben Affleck to share SBNMS with entire country  
Affleck would provide name recognition for Sanctuary  
Improve awareness and education  
Work on finding funding for educational video....Carnegie Inst provided original funding

Concerned that education especially and outreach is the first to go when budgets get tight....this is a BIG mistake

Regional organizations would be happy to work with SBNMS to help with outreach

Local institutions (teachers) can help get msg out

Budget for ed needs to be increased; if SBNMS had the money they could better take advantage of regional partnerships; also partnerships are a good way to secure funding and leverage critical mass of dollars

SBNMS needs to solicit funding from other organizations to help with education (and partners)

SBNMS needs to connect better

Sanctuary has been used in the past for the Mimi cvideo

Past 10 yrs science has increased knowledge of seafloor habitat  
Need more concrete protections of benthic habitat and use of ecosystem based management

SBNMS is sanctuary in name only

Current SB regs do not protect ecological or biological integrity adequately nor biodiversity per mandate of NMSA

When SBNMS was designated the threat was offshore drilling and structures  
Since then Northeast faces a fish stocks crisis  
Bottom gear can have irreparable harm to benthos  
SBNMS mngmnt plan needs to evolve to acknowledge fishing  
Need to acknowledge that some uses (e.g. fishing) are not compatible with goals of NMSA

NEFMC has used area closures for mngmnt tool

Use of "no take" areas should be used as part of SB mngmnt

SBNMS has a reg not to disturb seafloor; can't see how bottom fishing is legal

Is exemption for traditional fishing still appropriate? Answer is no

What is traditional fishing practices?

Issues in management plan update are good; but no actions

Why no actions made on list that is 3-4 years old?

We should take action on identified issues faster (98-99)

Match educational programs / curriculum to state and local frameworks / curriculum in MA

How do educational projects mesh with state / local educational goals?

This is a good way to find partners and leverage money

Partner with local university system

Ship traffic / ship strike is a critical problem

Very difficult to regulate traffic which is why education is so important

Ocean is as valuable resource as are land resources

Tying together land and ocean is good to provide understanding of linkages

So much land is protcted and so little ocean

Need to identify areas within SBNMS to deserve more protection

If willing to protect land, we should do so in ocean

Survey shows strong public support (7/10 in the NE) for greater protection in SB

Needs to be recognized the SBNMS is a public resource; SB needs to be one of the ones making this statement;  
SB is not just for local users but must be protected for long term and for all

All ocean is a public resource

Public concerns should be paramount (not just stakeholders)

Public should be deciding factor of what a sanctuary is

To date 15,000 comments rec'd by SBNMS in support of fully protected areas in SBNMS

Ocean resources do not belong to commercial user (which means primarily extractive user)

While SBNMS is critical to New England, sanctuary is a National issue to the decision to protect the

ANWR

Boundaries of Sanctuary must be expanded to include Jeffreys Ledge as important NR Whale habitat;

SBNMS regs prohibit take of marmam and sea turtles; fishing takes these species ; this is inappropriate in a  
Sanctuary and especially for the animals listed as endangered

Reduce to the point of eliminating impacts on marmam and other protected species from human activity in the  
Sanctuary

What is traditional fishing has been changing over time (e.g. monofilament line is not traditional)

Take of marine mammals of the scale of fishing would normally require many permits

SBNMS should be regulating extractive activities within SBNMS

NMSA allows Sanctuary the power to regulate fishing when interfering with SB's primary mission of resource protection therefore SBNMS needs to recognize the contradictions they currently work under and regulate according to the NMSA mandate which is the law / organic statute for the Sanctuary program; regulations must respect that law

FKNMS has designated no take areas; CINMS is in the process; this was accomplished through transparent public processes that brought together all stakeholders; SBNMS should pursue a similar goal and use a similar process

There was too little advertising announcing New Bedford scoping meeting

For shipping lanes – underwater sound bouys so whales don't enter lanes?

- Coordinate with Office of Naval Research

- Create a vessel mounted deterrence system

Enhance scoping attendance for fishermen through new means

DMF is finishing MPA policies with emphasis on resources, gear and bottom habitat

- SBNMS will have a copy of these before the scoping deadline of Oct 18

MPA policies will also be developed by NEFMC; SBNMS should pay attention to these

Issue of compatible uses –

- What are compatible human uses consistent with goals and missions of SBNMS

- what criteria to use; how does NOAA determine compatibility?

- Clarify these in the development of management options

MPA v. SBNMS clarify the difference

Vessel speed is an issue for marine mammals

Identify outreach and educational opportunities with outside entities

- Internet access from ships for real time data

- Track marine life; observe from remote location; superimpose with GPS info from ship

Establish "no take" reserves for research and conservation of biodiversity

Interact better with schools – set up educational programs

## Habitat protection

- Assist NEFMC

- SBNMS should identify habitat that provides important shelter and food sources (example cod / flounder)

- SBNMS should recommend to the council areas that should be set aside as research only areas (could be temporary)

- Develop partnerships with commercial fishermen and industry

- Especially collaborative research

- SBNMS with fishing industry should develop research proposals for NMFS, etc.

- Priority on research

- Give money to fishermen if they can't fish or if they participate in research

- Establish additional sanctuary areas or expand boundary to adjacent areas

- Create connecting corridor if non contiguous areas

- Set up working group of advisory council to deal with educational component

- Partnerships / collaborations with people on the water

- School collaborations

- SBNMS needs better regs and enforcement for whale protection

- Private boats in whaling areas are dangerous

- Close SBNMS to fishing if that is good for fish stocks and conservation

- Current closures are not sufficient

- SBNMS should comment on Amendment 13

- Advocate for a full year round closure of SBNMS

- SBNMS should be aware of potential problems created by zoning

- Alien people

- Create conflicts between users

- Increased enforcement costs

- Clarify and inform public on definitions used when discussing revision of management plan

- Marine biodiversity

- Ecosystem based management

- What is the role and significance of SB in GoM ecosystem?

- Raise awareness to general public of existence and function of SBNMS

- Perform training of people who will train teachers about SBNMS (teacher workshops)

- Inform of resources available for educational purposes

Push for higher level of interest in NOAA's upper ranks

SBNMS should do outreach and meetings with fishermen

Fishermen have good ideas on how to manage area

We should all work together for better science

SBNMS should be sensitive to fishermen's concerns and their fear that SB may be close to them

SBNMS needs to build trust with fishermen

Have a workshop with SAC, staff and fishermen to get ideas on management options

(maybe meet with commercial and recreational fishermen separately)

NB; Ptown; Sci; Glou

Assess whether important to expand boundary to include Jeffreys Ledge

What other areas may be worthy of sanctuary status? GSC?

Be very careful with economic analysis in EIS

Profile research and publish as soon as possible

Information takes too long to get to the public and decision makers

Make public aware of research that would show the importance of the sanctuary

peer review takes a long time

outreach and education on research and findings

often not enough money dedicated to getting the word out

personal understanding and connection will bring interest and funding

get public out on the water

Be aggressive with comments on projects that could affect SBNMS

Be aware of what is being planned / proposed adjacent to SBNMS

Equip vessels in vicinity of SBNMS with instrumentation to collect data (e.g. water quality) for education; research and monitoring

Vessels should receive money for this service

Commercial fishermen have info re: water temp; salinity; wind, etc but there is no incentive to share

## Provincetown Scoping Meeting 9/26/02

SBNMS needs better guidance on dealing with issues outside Sanctuary that affect sanctuary resources (e.g. migratory species)

SBNMS is not a closed system so must incorporate bigger picture in mngmnt analysis

Must perform a prioritization of marine mammal impacts to determine fact from perception

No scientific evidence of long term impacts from human activities

Use scientific criteria as basis for regulation when available

In absence of science use precautionary principle

SBNMS must take a more proactive approach to issues,

Use fishermen's knowledge

Include fishermen in addressing resource issues

Encourage alternatives

There is no silver bullet fix

Challenge stakeholders to come up with solutions

SBNMS should have more teeth regarding all vessels in the vicinity of whales

Make existing fed regs more effective in SBNMS,

Use education to inform the public

Dispel sanctuary myths

Clarification needs to be done before issues can be prioritized

Need regionally targeted education programs

Ned to balance between the steak and the sizzle....

Balance short term visible quick fix with long term solution

SBNMS needs stronger positive image

Sanctuary is a well kept secret

In "going public" basis must be clarity and integrity not wishy washy compromise to say you've done something

Commercial fishing

Should not be stopped or restricted in SBNMS

Barr said would not affect fishing industry

SBNMS was only to stop mineral development

Fish species are recovering

Rolling closures and other restrictions from NMFS and NEFMC doing their job

SB is special – good fish stocks

It is mainly commercial fishermen out that far

Do not expand boundaries

Concentrate on wetlands and coasts for protection

Do not expand boundaries – old or small boats can't go out further

Don't stop commercial fishing in SBNMS

Develop database to determine impact of MWRA outfall on commercial and recreational fishing grounds

Monitor for baseline of dumping activity; boat activity; radioactive materials; outfall

They never had baseline before MWRA outfall

Do not ban commercial fishing

Ban the outfall from Boston

WGoM closed area that overlaps with SBNMS should be used for research area through the habitat team of NEFMC

Determine the effects and impacts of the outfall pipe

Identify and protect most ecologically sensitive areas and close to all extraction

Do not stop commercial fishing in SBNMS

Don't stop commercial fishing

Don't stop commercial fishing

Don't expand boundaries – shrink boundaries

No permits

Whiting fish is inexpensive and important for nutrition

Consider people who eat this inexpensive fish

Don't close SBNMS

There is a net developed for whiting that comes a few feet off the bottom

Reduces bycatch

Approved by DMF

People will lose livelihood of fishing if you close SBNMS

Large group of people from Ptown; NB; Boston

Change current boundaries so sanctuary will be only sliver in WGoM that is the existing closed area



No net increase in restricted access

Now can only fish 1/3 of area NE used to fish

Socio economic impacts must be examined when updating SBNMS management plan

Do not restrict fishing in SBNMS

Move whale watching industry to other areas not fishermen

Change boundary to consider other areas for sanctuary such as No Mans Island and not Stellwagen Bank

No net increase in closed area

Allow NE fishermen to sit down with charts and give opinion in issues for SBNMS and areas for closures

NOAA should understand challenge for Ptown fishermen to put food on table for their families

NOAA can go out on fishing boat to observe is interested

Ptown has 6-7 months when they can't fish; Ptown particularly hit bad by fishing restrictions

Also have fishing limits and have to throw back fish

We don't need the Sanctuary

Mistake in trawl survey caused problems in research and restrictions, etc.

Outfall pipe should not be allowed

Most of general public can't access SBNMS so it is not like a national park

Mainly accessed via email

Fishermen can get there and need it to feed their families

No limitation to commercial access because there is no where else to go

Sanctuary designated for marine mammals so no human need ever go there

Commercial fishermen should fish in a responsible manner in SBNMS

Fishermen have guidelines from NMFS / Council that protect marine mammals

Algae was a big problem this summer (worst in memory) Why?

Water quality should be #1 concern because MWRA Outfall is going to cause irreversible damage to a natural treasure

SBNMS should work with fishermen to explain what bottom habitat is most important to conserve and why

SBNMS must build trust with fishermen and educate them on issues

SBNMS should build good working relationship with Ptown fishermen

Empower commercial fishermen to monitor water quality especially in areas not along the coast of in SBNMS

Expand boundaries to include WGoM

Concerned about impacts of regs on Ptown fishermen

Develop monitoring system for closed areas (once determined by SBNMS)

- Info should be used by decision makers

- Use adaptive management

- Decisions should be based on information gathered by scientific methods and sound research

All resources are still there even though fishermen fished the bottom for generations and all year round

Some parts of the sanctuary need protection (complex habitats) while others don't

- Rely on fishermen for information

Maintain continued access to fishing grounds – no limits

Proper research and not emotion should be driving closures

- Fishermen want to know why decisions are made

Fishermen should assist in evaluating facts and participate in research

Don't want a virtual fishery – hire Ptown fishermen to help in process and research

Should have next meeting in Ptown town hall as well

SBNMS should not try to regulate commercial fishing

- SBNMS should not restrict existing fishing operations

- Resource is strong...don't need additional

- Ptown counts on SB to make a living

- If we remove fishermen from SB then removing caretakers and best stewards

- Fishing should be regulated within existing parameters

- No additional layers of regulation

- Towing across sand bank does not hurt anything, this is a sand bar not a coral reef

Aquaculture is essentially non existent in US; most is inland; less than 2% seafood produced in US is AQ

- Offshore Aq (EEZ) can be important

- Concerns exist with salmon farms in Maine (pollution, feed, antibiotics, genes

- Surf clam Aq is environmentally benign as opposed to salmon

  - No selective breed genetics

SW corner of SBNMS was dredged extensively 15 – 20 yrs ago  
This area can be used for aq because it is shallow (60 feet at low tide)  
No clear Fed authority for aq ops in EEZ  
Becoming too dependent on other countries for food

SB is used by all for commercial activity  
Economic engine of Ptown

Scientific studies should have a fisherman on the boat

Need better involvement of the public in sanctuary

There has been a lot of misinformation regarding gear; mobile gear operators are not draggers

Gerry Studds promised fishers would not be forced out of SB

Management plan cannot be done from DC; to be done well must be science based local knowledge

Decisions need to be based on good research not speculation

Need very good research  
Not enough has been done  
Can't make changes without it

What can we do to make it better for fishermen?  
(no new regs doesn't make it better)

SBNMS should become model for nation for sustainable fishing

How do we make for a better fishery besides more reg  
Role for SBNMS in fisheries enhancement not management

Ptown fleet has a unique problem (day fishers) – this their water  
SBNMS has responsibility to Ptown fleet  
SBNMS needs to establish bond with Ptown fleet

Concerned about GoM in general  
Should protect natural stocks so they can continue to be caught  
Things are very different now in terms of # and size of fish than with our fore fathers  
Other countries use marine reserves as tool for improving fisheries (e.g. New Zealand)  
No take areas will allow for restoration of natural stocks which move out of the reserve and get caught

SB should consider true sanctuaries within its boundary  
Marine reserves as subset areas within SB  
Concern that whale and fish stocks won't recover due to excess stresses on them  
Lets learn from Right whale and passenger pigeon

Commercial fish stocks are dependent on entire system which is why setting aside areas will help protect long term commercial catch  
2 fishermen on SAC will help provide overview for decision makers

Diversity of benthos is often overlooked; happy to see this being looked at in SBNMS

Important to get good data for those who set policy  
SB is an ideal opportunity to get good data

Most people don't know about SBNMS  
It is difficult to get message out because people can't go out and see it  
Figure out how to collaborate with others (CCS, CCNS, school systems)

Concerned about effect of noise on marine life in general  
Has there been any monitoring to know levels of noise pollution

Vessel traffic levels and speed are constantly increasing  
SB should consider speed limit because, among other reasons, there could be considerable loss of life if collision at sea  
Jet boats go over 38 knots and are used in whale watching  
Concern about the density of use of site and potential collision

Whale watching industry is unregulated and should be addressed

Speed issue with shipping....there should be speed limits in SBNMS

Number of ships crossing SBNMS in shipping lanes is not addressed in SOS report

Develop research to know what shippers are doing  
Ballast; speed

Most traffic is large commercial vessels  
Are vessels transiting on schedule at higher speeds  
SBNMS should look at effluent discharge of commercial shippers, cruise ships and whale watch boats

SBNMS was designated because of strip mining (sand / gravel)  
Maintain the existing reg

MWRA Outfall pipe should be monitored and other coastal outfalls

Never seen algae so bad as this year around race point....why?

Speed limits will improve SB's ability to protect whales and sea turtles

Falmouth Scoping meeting 9/28/02

Name "Sanctuary" is misleading

- Sanctuary is not one

- Sanctuary implies preservation, can't do anything

- This sanctuary functions as multi use zone; not per NMSA mandate of compatible use

Vessel speed and proximity to whales are cause for concern

Protect commercial fishermen's interests, concern for being shut out, and violation of the "promise"

Protect interests of commercial fishermen

Protect interests of commercial fishermen don't lock out fishermen

Protect interest of commercial fishermen regarding entanglements of marine mammals

- Clean up ghost gear to avoid blaming the wrong people

- Buy back of line if gear changes required

- Keep SB open, fishermen are already aware of entanglement / avoid being redundant with ongoing activities regarding entanglement

- CCBay (critical Eg habitat) next to SBNMS (MPA) , fishermen re afraid of too much ocean off limits for a wide range of issues.

- Fishermen want to be part of any process

Concerned about sanctuaries ability to protect resources,

- For commercial and non-commercial uses and resources

- when SB leadership in protection was shown - effort disappeared and went no where

- mandate under sanctuary act is to consider compatible uses

- existing processes function under different framework of multiple use / not appropriate or adequate

Ensure species regrowth, protection, clean water

Sanctuary has ability to protect resources without compromising, allow multiple compatible uses

Opposed to high speed vessels in SBNMS

Whale watch guidelines too strong in 2 mile limit to slow down; need to be reviewed

- Review difference between guidelines and proposed regs

MWRA outfall is an issue of concern to fishermen

- Why have systems shifted per "bait bag" monitoring?

There was a lack of opposition to pipeline and extra nine miles into Mass Bay

Concerned sanctuary name is a misnomer – name has nothing to do with the sanctuary itself

- Species protection didn't relate to Sanctuary (other agencies i.e. ESA; MMPA etc)

Seafloor impacted by dragging gear  
Marine zoning approach to management should be considered  
Consider rollover system where some parts closed; some parts open and then shifted

Concerned about effect of fixed fishing gear impacts on right whales

Concerned about impact of shipping lanes on right whales

There are now 10x more groundfish and flounder than there were 10 years ago  
Interested in stopping rolling closures and eliminate days at sea

Never seen a whale entanglement in 12 years fishing on SB

Closures don't coincide with saving anything

Concerned with creating no take fish reserves  
Don't want to see closure of areas year round  
Large part of sanctuary already closed to commercial fishing  
Consider rolling closures

Plymouth, Ptown, Glouc fishermen taking a big hit in fisheries restrictions  
Concerned commercial fishermen's access to sanctuary will be restricted by things not naturally explained  
They had been told they would never be excluded from SB  
Yet it happened....WGoM cut territory  
Cumulative actions reduces access

Identify what are effects of mobile gear in habitat destruction?

There has been an increase in biomass over dragged areas in Sanctuary not damaging

Water quality  
Outfall pipe is severely affecting the ecosystem  
Codfish industry is impacted  
No tuna in 3 years; one whale in September

Primary concern needs to be protection of natural resources  
Sanctuary name is a misnomer  
Sanctuary needs to clarify its job and name to determine whether priority is protection or allowable activities

Sanctuary talks about ecosystem based management v. single species management  
The authority or ability of sanctuary to actually do this needs to be addressed

Protect SBNMS from floating casinos and bottom mining

Timing of meeting was not good, (Sat.) only reason fishermen could be there was because weather was blowing and couldn't get out to fish

Research and monitor outfall pipe to determine any impacts on food web

Water quality issues would be highest priority

Lack of growth this year on lobster pots a concern

Things are different this year....why?

Industry willing to work with SBNMS to create closing habitat areas

Industry observation can assist scientists in determining closed areas

Law enforcement is seriously lacking

Fishermen and bureaucrats need to work together and build trust

Concerned that sanctuary does not have proper human nor financial resources

WGoM has already closed 20% of SBNMS to fishing

There is a clear struggle of how to apply NMSA, SBNMS does not know what its job is so it does nothing that can't be done by another agency

Mandate is ecological protection

Original plan deferred to NEFMC in fisheries activities; given current trends and resource issues is that still appropriate?

Role for SBNMS for no take zones

Consider other agencies and closures

Create a matrix of other agencies activities to avoid redundancy

What is the responsibility of SBNMS

Know the purpose of the no take zone you want

What is the process to determine no take zone?

How do you think through process for deciding no take?

Learn from other sanctuary sites

SBNMS can provide information, research, etc; provide control site / no take

SBNMS must work within the context NMSA not Magnuson, etc.

What is NMSA mandate?

Outfall pipe must be monitored for impacts including fresh water inflow

Water temp hotter than normal this year

Lack of plankton blooms in 2002 thus lack of whales, etc

Is this part of a cycle of from the outfall?

Why 2002 anomalies?

Opposed to high speed boats in SBNMS

Must move fast on this as more high speed vessels are being purchased

SBNMS can help NMFS with whale regs

Details; different species

NMFS must be careful in preparing regs because they are hard to change

Completely against no take areas

Speed and ship strikes are more of a problem than entanglement for whales

Ecosystem based management is good as it encourages good research

Not used for SBNMS

SBNMS shouldn't duplicate research on MWRA; instead support ongoing work such as CCS / MWRA and make reports readily available to public

Dredge material can't be dumped but bilge and ballast water etc can. This is adding to water quality stresses

Change reg to eliminate or monitor dumping from cruise ships and whale watch boats

Monitor gray water discharge and for invasive species

Regulate recreational boats around whales better.

Provide better outreach and education for recreational boaters related to whales

Certify whale watching boats so they can get closer to whales than other vessels

Don't allow any special certification for whale watch boats

Enforcement presence makes a difference

Minimize boats on whales

Recreational boaters tend to do what they want with little communication and no repercussions

NMFS monitors effects of outfall on wildlife

SBNMS should use cooperative research to determine effects on fish and living marine resources

If there is a determination that outfall is impacting LMR then through the CWA designate a special water designation for SBNMS

Completely against no take zones

Will eliminate conclusive science since commercial fishing vessels provide the important info

Speed limit won't be enforceable

Whales can hear small boats – the superclass boats kill whales – slow them down

Consider the historical usage of the area and maintain access



Cultural history includes fishing on the bank

Against no take zones

WGoM and rolling closures equal 80 – 90 % closed for 6 months of the year

This is enough, fish stocks are coming back

Use existing closed areas (WGoM) for research

WGoM = 12 inch roller gear restriction

Most could only be accessed if you use gear larger than this so most of the area can't be fished

Especially when considered with rolling closures and no take zones

All fisheries regs should stay in NEFMC process

Make research and data more readily available

Collaboration and exchange of data is important

SBNMS should fill in gaps; don't repeat research

SBNMS needs to be more involved in education and outreach, especially to elementary schoolers

This is critical time to get kids to understand importance of healthy ocean

Vehemently opposed to no take zones

Too many restrictions / regs

Fish stocks are back up

Fishermen were guaranteed that SBNMS would stay open to fishing

Water quality issues include

Outfall; vessel dumping; non point source pollution

Does SBNMS have enough information and monitoring to carry out its mandate?

Is there a functional response plan

Must provide education and outreach to all vessels

Can't follow rules / regs if unaware of them

Concerned about for profit industries buying access and usage of SBNMS

Fibre optic cables; windfarm; others?

Can SBNMS carry out mandate due to lack of regulatory structure and enforcement?

To monitor larger scale changes such as global climate change buoys should be put in SBNMS for monitoring

Perform research into how Outfall pipe is affecting LMR's in SBNMS

Closer to pipe = more of a dead zone

Monitor the impacts of the outfall pipe

Regarding outfall pipe – nothing can be done

It is on line

Sanctuary should look at what can be done regarding enhanced monitoring of impacts  
Fishermen don't want to be blamed for reduction of fish near outfall pipe when it may be the outfall discharge affecting the ecosystem

Involve industry in research

Reach out to young kids with respect to fishing community; culture; heritage  
Not just the ecological aspects of the Sanctuary

Get research papers on industrial sound impacts and signatures re:  
Outfall pipe development; bid dig; some related to boats, not the outfall

Commercial Lobstermen's Assoc helping fund outfall monitoring  
CCS study

Concerned about cleaning process by MWRA of "shocking" pipes to clean diffusers  
No monitoring of this process

Look at impacts of outfall pipe on whale distribution  
That would be the key to put the plug in the end of the pipe.....  
Impacts on whales get a higher profile than impacts on fishing industry

Get information about the outfall pipe out to public; make information accessible and comprehensible

Gloucester Scoping Meeting 9/30/02

High speed vessels lead to possible collisions with other vessels

Change all whale watching guidelines to mandatory and enforceable regulations; promulgate regs immediately

Improve education / outreach re: whale watching issues (c.g. high speed collision)

License to operate WW vessel in SBNMS should be required

Current enforcement measures are inadequate

Fines should be levied on those violating regs

Keep SBNMS open to commercial fishing; no new additional closures

No new WW regs for SBNMS

Consider no discharge regulation for SBNMS

SBNMS should create a vision for the Sanctuary within the tenets of the NMSA

Create long term goals for SBNMS

Create system for determining management effectiveness

Do not manage SBNMS "species – specific" should be managed under the principles of ecosystem based management

Stop mid water trawling for species such as herring

Further explore marine zoning

Further examine whale watching issues;

- Possible new regs may be ok but must be enforceable

- Skeptical that any of these regs can be enforced

- Enforcement of whale watching very difficult

Issues other than WW may be more important

- Vessel traffic; outfall; regulatory discards of fish caught beyond existing limit

If commercial fishing not allowed in SBNMS then

- Redraw lines of SBNMS or trade area so fishermen can still work the bank and

- SBNMS must work with other regional authorities to keep the area open to fishing

Address regulatory discard problem

- Must work towards no dumping of any fish allowed
- What goes in net stays in boat
- Work with processors to be able to market any take

Increase education efforts on PWC in SBNMS re: speed and reporting

No dumping of hagfish remains in SBNMS

If WW regs promulgated, they must address acoustics

SBNMS should duplicate the existing GoM closure within the SBNMS; need scientific control to determine effects of trawls on benthic habitat

- SBNMS must dedicate program staff / funds to monitoring program

Need final clarification of SBNMS in fisheries management (in conjunction with NMFS)

- Conflicting mandates within NOAA between SBNMS and NMFS

SBNMS should issue official comment on any USN acoustics testing within the Sanctuary

Improve research on Water Quality issues within SBNMS

- Outfall; discard; etc

- Communicate these results in understandable language

There is a need for research reference closed areas

Must communicate the results of these research efforts to NEFMC

“larger” trawlers should not be allowed on the Bank

- Larger determined by net size / drag width/ hull size

- Many of these vessels are already restricted due to roller size limits

mid water trawls have large impact ; should be banned in SBNMS

leave ww boats alone because they serve as “sanctuary monitors”

- i.e. notify of collisions, accident, entanglement

don’t promulgate any regs unless they can be enforced

SBNMS has recently placed too much emphasis on SCR’s;

- Other authorities and entities exist to handle that

- These others, more expert than SBNMS, should have lead

SBNMS should dedicate its resources to ecosystem protection mission of SBNMS rather than SCR’s

Need increased visibility, especially on North Shore (Glouc, etc)

SBNMS should release coordinates of Portland, especially to draggers

Enforcement of regs absolutely critical, if non-enforceable, then waste of time

Examine current boundary for ecosystem representation

Any speed regs should apply to all boats (not just ww vessels)

No single entity should be isolated

Examine boundary for user group representation

Don't impact one industry more than another

Further research water quality issues to determine sources and possible mitigation

Non point; outfall; ocean dumping; up stream rivers

Expand boundaries to include entire length of Jeffreys Ledge

Minimize herring fishery on Jeffreys Ledge

Create database of marine invertebrates within SBNMS

Things are working the way they are; don't need additional regs

Has SBNMS assessed what the affects of the outfall are?

Concerned about damage being done to the Sanctuary by human uses

What kinds of monitoring does SBNMS do?

SBNMS and sanctuary program needs to work with FMC on fishing issues in Sanctuary

What are sanctuary plans to work with the council?

Boundary of sanc should be extended northward to include all of Jeffreys Ledge

Establish no take areas within SBNMS

There should be no take areas and no disturbance of the seafloor

Clarify restrictions on whale watching

Guidelines

Concerned about the incompleteness of the State of the Sanctuary report

This is not s state of the sanctuary; it is a snapshot of what has been going on in last few years

The SOS should include status and trends (i.e. what's going on, any improvement?)

Sanctuary should be able to extrapolate trends

Questions about the Sanctuary purpose

Changes from original focus and original plan (i.e. pots, effects on comm. fishermen)  
Concerned for any implementation of sanct action that could negatively impact comm. fishing

Concerned about impact so f Sanctuary on commercial fishing

Need evaluation of state of the sanctuary from 10 yrs ago to today  
To determine if there have been changes in status or resources before suggesting new changes

Concerned about impacts of bottom fishing gear on habitats

Create protected areas / marine preserves within the Sanctuary

Before any changes made to the management plan sanctuary needs to evaluate status and trends because  
Sanctuary created 10 years ago, what is real State of the sanctuary

Need to articulate state of the sanctuary  
Identify trends and report back to public  
Water quality, habitat, bottom gear, effects of closed areas, species interactions, interface with  
other management efforts

Does Sanctuary determine impacts on local people  
Such as no take areas

Concerned about SBNMS closing areas  
This is a change from the original management plan

SB region is most heavily regulated in country from the perspective of comm. fishermen  
(NMFS, NEFMC, etc)

Concerned that permanent closures will put fishermen out of business

Any discussion of fisheries management issues should use existing process, i.e. FMC, state reduction plans

Sanctuary should continue to participate in established processes

When discussing any regs that would affect fishermen; marine mammals (take reduction teams)

Concerned for more than 1 proposal  
Amendment 13 could call for closure of all of SB for year round , permanent closure  
This would result in loss of interest by fishermen in mngmnt of SB

Concerned by process – “sum of all fears”  
Concerned that something will become institutionalized as legitimate without data  
Management issues raised will become institutionalized as legit without data to substantiate

Concerned about how sanctuary will prioritize issues brought up during scoping

Clarify and communicate the process

Commercial fishermen as the eyes and ears of what is going on out in sanctuary and reporting of incidents  
i.e. oil spills, trash, violations etc.

SBNMS should not have role in regulation of commercial fishing

Current authorities are adequate and fishermen re familiar with processes and players involved

What good are scoping meetings?

What is accomplished?

Fishermen use largest mesh size – 6.5 inches to reduce bycatch of juveniles

SBNMS should use independent process like that of the FKNMS and CINMS to look at need and designation of marine reserves to protect habitat and biodiversity

Fear of more closed areas and not having a say in what is decided

Need open and transparent process

Issues affecting fishing should stay with std process of NEFMC

SBNMS should conduct information discussions with people who are interested in other processes than inshore fishers at other sites

Interested in east side of SBNMS that overlaps with WGoM closure including:

what is sanctuary investigating, where

what period of time

what results are

make this an open process on the grounds that SBNMS is opposing redrawing WGoM closure due to ongoing research

communicating about process should be annual event

updates; progress reports; financial spending, etc – like grant review process

Who makes final decision or review?

Get input from commercial fishing

Is public asked if final MP s ok?

At what point are draft regulations open to the public

SAC doesn't accurately represent a;; of interests

How can comm. fishing rep who doesn't fish sanct waters give input?

Concern for how seats were advertised and selected

Concern that SAC deceived out of vested interests

Management of fishing stocks – where is it going?

Who is researching – communicating about the life history aspect

Hard to comment on what needs to be done in SBNMS

SBNMS needs to state historic baselines better and identify changes

SBNMS trying to do something they know nothing about

Concern about how ecosystem plan developed and how issues prioritized

Concerns when individual species have management plans that are interchangeable

What does ecosystem plan look like?

How does management plan account for naturally occurring cyclical events

Establish baseline and make that information publicly available

Few people (including SBNMS) know what the status of the sanctuary is

SBNMS should monitor predator / prey relationships throughout the sanctuary

i.e. sand eels, herring

understand food web

identify correlations between oceanographic features and predator / prey relationships

Sanctuary must work with NEFMC to ensure continuation of research in “sliver” of WGoM closure

This area should become habitat research area under Amendment 13

Results of research should be publicized

Commercial fishing should continue in SBNMS

Fishing methods used historically (commercial, recreational, charter) should continue in SBNMS

Re: habitat issue, SBNMS needs to rank the magnitude of order of affects on seabed

Investigate why marine mammals have left sanctuary this year

Prepare annual monitoring plan of conditions that can affect marine mammals

Sanctuary needs to calculate and evaluate reduction in fishing effort on bottom since '92

What has sanctuary done since then to account for reductions in marine mammal populations

Sanctuary needs to honor commitment to leave fisheries management to NEFMC

Very few boats fishing in sanctuary

No more needs to be done; self regulating via existing council regs

Don't close down commercial fishing in SBNMS

More studies on effect of sewer outfall on sanctuary, especially impacts on sand eels and on Middle Bank

Study the affects of mid water herring trawl gear on the destruction of the food chain



This is not a historic fishery....only occurring in last three years

Whale watching guidelines currently in need to be made into regs

Sanctuary needs to directly enforce both commercial and recreational whale watchers

Include fishermen in studies that examine affects of fishing on habitats

Sanctuary needs to protect resources and the ecosystem

To protect ecosystem and keep it stable

Need to have commercial fishery for dogfish in sanctuary because they are eating everything

Stop micro managing the fishery; Treat as multispecies complex

Needs to be established sanctuary mechanism written into MP that will only close fishing if comparative science proves fishing is detrimental to habitats and ecosystems

Readers digest version of public comment does disservice to the democratic public process – this process is an insult

NE seafood coalition recommends that any activities / proposals affecting commercial fishing in SBNMS need to be directed to coalitions so they have ample time for comment

Direct these to Steven Oulette, esq.

Speaking for Ma Lobstermen's Assoc Keep fishing open in SBNMS

SBNMS may be able to regulate bottom impacts but other animals move in and out of sanctuary so how does SBNMS regulate that?

There should be some type of permitting for commercial and recreational whale watching

Whale watchers should be educated on how to approach whales safely

This includes speed, manner of approach, how to detect whales

Only boats trained and permitted should be allowed to approach whales to 100 feet

Others need to stay further away

Permitted boats need a visible mark (e.g. display flag) to id them as permitted

The reason this sanctuary was set up was to prevent mining

The sanctuary shouldn't have any restrictions on the way commercial / recreational fishing is done at this time

Everything should stay the same; maintain no mining restriction

Reason for SBNMS under NMSA is to protect resources and allow uses that are compatible with that purpose

Sanctuary should look at current uses and revise MP

Sanctuary should consider no take zones in protecting sanctuary resources

How can you have a no take zone when these are public resources

North Shore Community Tuna Assoc statement is that

Members have historically fished in sanctuary for generations

There should be no changes or limitations to tuna fishing activities

Regarding ecosystem, if there are any proposals to be made, the commercial organizations listed here in the comments should be involved in a working group with environmental groups and NMFS

Gulf of Maine Fishermen's Alliance is opposed to any restrictions to commercial fishing in sanctuary

Don't believe there was a promise that SBNMS would not regulate fisheries unoriginal sanctuary designation

Keep SBNMS the way it is and open to fishing, especially tuna fishing

Need to understand connection between private boats and whales

Leave SBNMS open to public

Expand boundaries of sanctuary to include Jeffreys Ledge

Boundaries of SBNMS are sufficient- maintain existing boundaries and access for consuming public through comm. fisheries

If any areas are closed in SBNMS for fishing then other areas must be opened

Keep existing boundaries for benefit of recreational and commercial fishing industry

Water quality monitoring is important because of outfall from Boston

Special consideration should be given within SBNMS for energy interests such as pipelines, cables

Keep Jeffreys ledge open just the way it is

No more regulations

No area trade offs

Make SBNMS management more visible to the public

Extend into north shore and Boston through venues or interpretive centers

SBNMS process would function much better if meshed with NEFMC process

Right now process is inefficient and ineffective

Establish radio station to monitor shipping / tanker traffic coming across SBNMS

Gloucester should be represented on SAC

Develop SBNMS information center in Gloucester

Regulated users within SBNMS need to be able to understand regulations / management within SBNMS

Need better research to show permanent damage to SBNMS resources

Extend boundary to include Jeffreys ledge to protect right whales

Educational component of SBNMS should target value of resources and not negative impacts of human uses

Do not exclude shipping from SBNMS

Speed restrictions should be put in place and whale watching guidelines should be better enforced  
Guidelines should be restructured to prevent harassment of marine mammals

Any expansion of SBNMS boundary should be clearly documented through investigation with reasons for doing so

No permanent structures should be allowed in SBNMS such as platforms, windmills, barges

Legal counsel or payment of legal counsel for fishing industry issues should be provided

Assess feasibility and costs associated with SBNMS enforcement  
Provide public education on enforcement costs

Do not regulate flight level of planes over SBNMS

Prohibit low frequency sonar within SBNMS

Permit dumping of crematory ashes by commercial boats within SBNMS

Perform more research on bycatch and effects of bycatch in SBNMS

Prohibit dumping of caskets and bodies within SBNMS

Reduce bycatch within SBNMS by making sure all catch is landed and utilized

Declare SBNMS day once a year for all users to come together and celebrate

One storm causes more damage than all fishing activities

SBNMS is a great resources for studying  
Develop internship / research program

Create "baykeeper" program to keep an eye on the resource

Land development is causing pollution which is contributing to marine resource problems  
SBNMS needs to recognize links with shore  
Determine if there is direct impact on SBNMS

Use best science to frame problem and make decisions

Focus on ecosystem based management  
Habitat is the integral part in SBNMS that needs protection  
Closed areas are needed to protect habitat

Increase visibility of SBNMS – develop a high profile visitors center

Create a visitors center on Cape Ann

Concerned about direction MP may go in as far as excluding certain uses  
Concerned about knee jerk reactions to “perceived” problems such as trawl impacts  
Make sure science is right before taking action

SB is important to day boats and mid range boats

Trawlers can offer benefits to management such as investigating dumpsite

Trawling on bottom may benefit benthos in terms of turnover and rejuvenation

We want SB to be protected and probably some areas should be protected

SB has been a traditional fishing area and a fundamental part of regional history

Need to understand what is impacting SB

Need more video / photo of SB to increase awareness – public broadcasting, web cams

Do we know the status of the resources?  
What's happened since '92?  
SOS does not tell us that

Develop volunteer corps to assist SBNMS

Consider regulations to better protect MarMam from vessel and gear impacts

Consider speed restrictions to protect whales in some areas but not in others

WW guidelines are not sufficient to protect marmam from WW activity

Enforcement needed of regulations  
Outreach needed also

CG Aux as outreach was not as effective as they could be

WW regulations should apply to all

Problem as are complex and not simple to solve

Need to be practical and sensible in solutions

Avoid making more problems in solving on problem

Coastal areas are linked to offshore areas

Need to protect both

Concerned that the MPR will become an excuse to unfairly restrict / blame commercial fishermen

Ecosystem is constantly changing

Need to understand long term trends and historical trends in fishery

Need to understand what areas are trawled and what % of SBNMS is fished

Concerned about SBNMS becoming sterile

e.g. so much regulation that it becomes impossible to do anything

e.g. sanctuary = hands off

Portland Scoping Meeting 10/01/02

Concerned about dragging through and disturbing cultural remains

- Form a baseline of information to prevent damage

- Create zone of protection around wrecks of cultural significance

- How can the people of Maine monitor the conditions of SCR's?

- What can we determine and document about wrecks to prevent further deterioration

Expand on SCR protection with interpretive material

Concerned about impacts of energy infrastructure in SBNMS such as pipelines etc.

- There should be prohibition of further disruption

SBNMS should create a true sanctuary within the sanctuary

- Need prohibitions on activities that are currently lacking

- Establish fully protected wildlife / marine areas

  - No take areas

- Purpose is for preservation of biodiversity and as scientific control; areas for studies

Create control area outside SBNMS

- Need sites closer to shore for monitoring of impacts

Prohibit discharge of grey water in SBNMS

SBNMS should be designated a no discharge zone per CWA

Publicize the research going on in SBNMS

Need to look at SBNMS in context of regional view and even hemisphere view

Regarding preservation and enhancement of species....

- What is there now?

- Perform comprehensive inventory of what is in SBNMS

Expand boundary of sanctuary to include Jeffreys Ledge

How were original boundaries designated?

- They seem to be arbitrary

To resolve entanglement problem develop buoy release system for lobstering

- Also do retrieval of ghost gear

  - Set a fee for retrieval of ghost wire traps

WGoM should be considered for full closure

- Sliver piece should be permanent closure for sake of research

If NMFS keeps larger area closed then include portion in SBNMS

How are numbers of vessels impacting marine mammals in SBNMS?

- Limit numbers of boats in proximity of whales

- How are large numbers of boats affecting the ecosystem

Reduce the rate of entanglement of marine mammals in fishing gear

Re route shipping lanes to avoid ship strikes

Why are boats allowed to discharge in the SBNMS?

Speed limit in the shipping lanes should be lower through the sanctuary

Concerned about commercial mariculture

- Too many unresolved questions and lack of regulations

- Should be no mariculture in SBNMS

Concerned about the issues in the original MP that didn't get dealt with

- Does SBNMS have capacity to do its job?

Don't want to see SBNMS privatized

- Private for profit activities should not be allowed in SBNMS

Don't overlook effect of dragging on benthos – this is just as important as things above it

Support boundary expansion to include Jeffreys Ledge

Assess whether inputs and outputs from MA Bay are a cause for concern.

- Need to improve monitoring program to look at if internal and external inputs are affecting SBNMS

Charge WW industry a per person fee and use money to provide boats with educational material on ecosystem of SBNMS and

- correct info on marine mammals and human interaction

- include information on biodiversity

Develop certification from sanctuary for whale watch operations to assure standardization of information

Sanctuary should act as more of a focal point for education on cultural and natural resources

- Continue to expand and provide education and outreach

In addition to charging whale bats a fee, charge recreational boats a fee

- This will reduce number of boats

- This will bring in resources for educational and outreach programs

Need to provide education on biodiversity, not just whales

Must have more law enforcement in SBNMS

Is SBNMS using logo for private programs?

Avoid the commercialization of NMS logo for private corps.

Don't discount idea of privatization just because it may be politically correct

Restrict speed of all vessels in SBNMS to protect whales

Create comprehensive mandatory regulations for whale watching vessels, not just guidelines

Concerned for disturbance of animals in addition to immediate physical harm

Need more research about impacts of vessels on whales

"good fences make good neighbors"

prevent dumping in "common" ground

balance the public costs versus private benefits of any action in SBNMS

Would privatization require amending designation document?

Private uses can be appropriate in SBNMS

Support more research on acoustic and sonar testing impacts

Continue to develop and promote research programs

To understand the overall ecology of the western Gulf of Maine

Perform research and impacts studies

SBNMS needs to fit into regional picture

Work with research institutions and other agencies to use resources to expand research and monitoring in SBNMS

Need ongoing water quality monitoring in SBNMS

Pay attention to implications of climate change and effects on SBNMS such as

harmful algal blooms

changes in species distribution

Extend and expand on cooperative research programs

Increase public awareness of SBNMS

provide better educational programs

establish loan exhibit; PBS program ; NPR program

education leads to better protection

Experiment with different ways of conserving bycatch



Increase public awareness – use the press as a means to communicate

How is value of resource (e.g. herring) measured?

Is there any indicator for value to whales in analysis?

Create cooperative program with business schools to be creative in planning for SBNMS

Look to NPCS and Acadia NP relationship as model

Collaboration for business planning and funding

Business school prepares outline of needs to carry out mission

Utilize fishermen on biodiversity

stop fishing in areas to prevent further depletion

Ensure appropriate monitoring of fibre optic cable

if new company takes over they need to pay for monitoring

Concerned about lack of policy regarding wind mills and permanent structures

Perform more research on impacts of MWRA outfall

Concerned about the impacts of fibre optic maintenance in ecosystem

Concerned about budget of SBNMS

can SBNMS perform its job?

What are restraints on increasing budget?

Prevent use of high speed ferries in SBNMS

Increase public awareness through schools

For MPR process, make sure all stakeholders are at the table

Both socio economic concerns and science need to be taken into account to locate areas for protection

Fully protected areas should be considered for species and ecosystem based management

Share results of research done within SBNMS

SBNMS boundaries should be expanded to include Jeffreys ledge

Increase public awareness and outreach

Listen to fishermen they know the resources

Increase public awareness through use of media

---

Concerned about scope and duration of MP

5 years is too short

need to plan for longer term vision and then perhaps manage in 5 yr increments

SBNMS should create no take areas for research control sites

Establish preservation areas

Ensure water quality protection from pollution

Establish no take reserves as control sites for research necessary but...

Integrate with other gulf wide activities

Careful consideration is necessary with gulf wide interests involved

Should be no commercial fishing within SBNMS

Should be no commercial fishing within SBNMS that damages the bottom or has bycatch

Allow sustainable commercial fishing through sustainable regulations

Not "all or nothing"

SBNMS should consider marine reserves, and uses that are compatible with resource protection

Commercial fishing should be maintained as long as it is not destructive (bottom trawling)

Establish "no mobile gear" areas

SBNMS should be southwestern hub for series of sanctuaries in GoM

Change whale watching guidelines to regulations and enforce

SBNMS resources are public, involve all stakeholders in MPR process

Research is needed in SBNMS

Create a place to conduct research without impacting commercial fishing

Keep offshore fishing boats out of SBNMS

Consider implementing no discharge zone

No ballast water dumping or uptake'

Create whale watching permits

Create WW regulations that control distance between boat and whale

Create more visitors centers including in Glouc and Boston

Increase research funding for SBNMS if not currently enough to meet mandate  
Create panel to review research program regularly

There should be no discharge within SBNMS

WW guidelines should become regulations

Who will enforce regulations?

WW guidelines implemented into regulations and determine protocols for all vessels in SBNMS with respect to marine mammals

Increase outreach / education and enforcement to make this happen

Identify and protect rare endangered species that live within or move through SBNMS, including plant life

Create aquaculture plan

Do not allow a marine feed lot within SBNMS

Do not allow Aq within SBNMS

There should be no discharge of any sort within SBNMS

There should be no discharge of any sort within any sanctuary

Some rules should be consistent across all sanctuaries

SBNMS should not allow any more special use permits until protocols are determined and appropriately reviewed

(i.e. fibre optic cables; wind farm, etc)

investigate restoration and cleanup of areas damaged or destroyed by environmental dumping (outfall)

ID mobile gear impacts to whales (entanglement issue) and how to protect against this

ID fixed gear impacts to whales (entanglement issue) and how to protect against this

Use best available science in decision making

Gill net / lobster gear needs to be marked to ID owner if gear in an entanglement

Quantify boat traffic year to year

Is it increasing?

Will SBNMS be over trafficked?

Identify carrying capacity of SBNMS

Ghost gear remediation plan is needed

Science to be used in decision making should involve academia and public

Science to be used in decision making should involve academia and public

Science to be used in decision making should involve academia and public

Determine how to determine overtraffic / carrying capacity

SBNMS does not have enough money or staff to deal with current research, monitoring, enforcement, outreach,  
Budget needs to increase to be able to perform mandate in future

Explore having underwater cameras – maybe on buoys with lights to attract LMRs

Get younger generation involved so they will work to preserve SBNMS

Mimic Canadian model per groundfish management plan and no take conservation areas

When referring to SB remember to refer to it as Middle Bank as that is the historic name

Portsmouth Scoping Meeting 10/2/02

Concerned about affects of sewage outfall on water quality

What are the impacts/

SBNMS needs to perform better monitoring of water quality

MPR is exciting time to do thoughtful review of what sanctuary can do better

Concerned that SBNMS allows commercial vessels to fish and whale watch

Why?

Can't understand why something called a sanctuary allows these activities

Sanctuary's supposed to be a safe place for animals

Gillnetting and dragging are destructive fishing practices but not for banning outright

If SBNMS wants active public involvement then need to be more proactive about getting info out

Need full information on table about all closures and elements of existing regs to get full picture of what already exists

People need to know / see what is already in place in terms of protection

At designation fishermen promised they would not be shut out of SBNMS

Comm. Fishermen initial fear of fishing bans when original MP was conceived'

Fishermen supported designation when got assurances from government that regs would not affect fishing access

Tuna industry opposed to restrictions such as changes in vessel speed (harpoon boats), anchoring, seine fishing

Don't want fishing regs coming from Sanctuary

Concern about high speed ferry from Portland to Cape

Concerned about ship strikes with whales

SBNMS should expand boundary to include Jeffreys Ledge

Need clarification of SBNMS management charge

Especially clarification of regulating fishing

Enforcement needs to be assessed at appropriate time

SBNMS must live up to obligation to NMSA to protect resources

MPR process provides a chance for thorough review and all regs and to coordinate with other agencies

EDIS needs to be clarified

Need economic impact analysis

Allocation of resources to other states (not for protection)

Vessel size as a limitation

Species are highly migratory , protected within boundaries but soon as they migrate out of boundaries then free game for all

Data needs to be on the table so people can make informed decisions on what to do about sanctuary

Must be statutory clarification about sanctuary authority to regulate commercial fishing

Perform a review of legislative history to clarify “promise” by SBNMS not to regulate fishing

When trying to regulate groups need to avoid regulatory redundancies

Does SBNMS know what other agencies have overlapping regs in SBNMS?

Concerned about alteration of ocean bottom via dragging

This must be changing habitat structure

Not enough of an outcry over dragging

Raise public awareness about sanctuary

Sanctuary should compile data and determine what it would take to protect marine biodiversity

Need to understand what is in sanctuary and where it is

Then plan to provide permanent protection

SBNMS should have fully protected marine reserves within SBNMS boundary

To raise public awareness improve information available regarding whales and sanctuary that comes from on board WW boats

Improve public awareness of existing fisheries regs in SBNMS

Some areas already closed to fishing

12 inch restriction on roller size on mobile gear

Commercial fishermen are active in protecting resources

but they need access to consuming public

Take steps to protect marine mammals

reduce number of nets in the area to reduce entanglement

Note existing fisheries closures that mitigate entanglement

Reconstruct SBNMS boundaries to include areas already closed for 10 years

Dredge dumpsite and outfall pipe are in close proximity to SBNMS boundary

MPR should investigate and Sanctuary should be more involved in activities taking place in these areas

Better monitoring of these sites and potential impacts on SBNMS

There is a lack of consistency regarding pollution in SBNMS

Speed of boats should be regulated via relationship between speed and mass  
Speed v mass controls how quickly vessel can avoid marine mammal

Create more visitors centers

Perform more active public outreach about what is SBNMS  
Target Aquariums with literature

SBNMS should take constructive role in solving bycatch problem  
This would ease feelings in fishing industry

Sanctuary should regulate pollution, discharges within boundaries  
e.g. gray water, ballast intake, vessel sewage dumping, outfalls

sanctuary budget is too excessive  
not justified given role of sanctuary and duplication of roles performed by other agencies  
SBNMS should have budget cap

Concerned about increasing size of SBNMS to include Jeffreys Ledge  
Potential increased restrictions on fishing  
Enough closures as it is

Redefine meaning of the word Sanctuary or rename program

Leave MP exactly as it is  
Biomass is expanding, marine mammals are increasing, fish stocks are increasing

Let existing fisheries management processes manage SBNMS

Limited access in time already for fishing

Sanctuary should adopt comprehensive socio economic analysis of fishing activity on SBNMS  
Who is affected by actions?  
People, gear types, communities  
Some of this work has already been conducted by other agencies

Marine reserves system should be defined with all of affected parties at the same table

NOS / NMFS must work together to collect data and clarify where data already exists

Sanctuary has an identity crisis; doesn't know who it is or what's going on or what it is supposed to be doing

SBNMS should address new and emerging issues that have come to light since original MP  
Habitat degradation; overfishing

Habitat destruction and overfishing need to be better managed

Expand SBNMS boundary to include length of Jeffreys Ledge

Better regulate whale watching vessels

- More education and outreach for private boaters

- Training and certification for commercial boaters

Must be better enforcement current whale watch related regs

- Focus on international vessels and provide them with better outreach and information on ship strikes

- Education needs to focus on collision

Basic awareness of SBNMS is non-existent

- Need to increase education and outreach efforts

SCR management is euro/american-centric;

- Need better efforts / improved focus on native american SCR's

- Should research existing treaties for proper identification of SCR ownership

- Respect and honor all treaties

- Make better efforts to know what native american SCRs exist in SBNMS

There has been no outreach to local tribal entities and inter-tribal councils

- Must preserve oral tradition regarding SBNMS area

No outreach has been done to regional archaeological societies so no opportunity for them to provide input

To expand SCR efforts beyond ship wrecks look to Danish model

Better define SBNMS position on salvage

- Position on implementation of salvage law regarding the marine envt

- Also archaeological resource protection laws

- What constitutes and SCR in SBNMS exactly?

Expand boundary to include Jeffreys Ledge; it is pointless to have only 1/3 of ledge inside SBNMS

Explore limitations on midwater trawls within SBNMS due to impacts on herring and other whale prey

- Important to recognize correlation between take of prey and whale abundance as well as with other marine organisms

- How is fishing impacting natural food chain?

Reduce vessel speeds for all vessels in SBNMS

Improve education and outreach to private boaters especially as it relates to whale watching

Make a better outreach effort to disseminate information on existing WW guidelines



There are currently too many boats on animals and too constantly  
Current distance and length of time on whales guidelines should be enforced

There needs to be speed reductions within SBNMS

SBNMS website is inadequate; it needs updating and enhancing

Outreach efforts are unclear;  
No one knows SBNMS exists  
SBNMS is missing key constituent groups

Need to update mailing list

Expand existing outreach efforts for marine debris and non point source pollutants

Expand boundary to include Jeffreys Ledge

SBNMS needs to do better monitoring and cleaning up of ghost gear

If you are going to call it a Sanctuary then make it a Sanctuary  
No one knows there is a sanctuary there  
Need more signage and exhibits dockside to inform boaters and users

All fishing should be banned in SBNMS due to overfishing and habitat destruction

Advocate buoy system at SBNMS to notify users of sanctuary boundary

SBNMS is not a “multi use” area;  
NMSA does not promote balance  
Primary purpose is conservation and uses that are compatible with that are allowed  
SBNMS should focus on protection of biodiversity and biological resources

Do not buoy system to identify SBNMS boundary due to possible impacts on marmam; already too many lines in the water

Eliminate fixed gear within SBNMS or have fishermen monitor gear on a full time basis to prevent entanglement

SBNMS is multi use site  
Implement socio economic impact analysis to determine impacts to user groups if certain activities are prohibited or limited  
This could produce results that support economic viability for regional users and harmonious dialogue among users

Improve existing protections for right whales and habitat within SBNMS

Increase outreach efforts for private vessels and whale watch boat on “what to do” when encountering an entangled whale

SBNMS needs to take a greater role in monitoring MWRA outfall

SBNMS needs to make greater effort at “true” resource protection, a la CINMS / FKNMS and Tortugas reserves processes

Standardization of whale watch educators and naturalists that should present on all vessels going to SBNMS would serve outreach efforts very well

When sanctuary was designated, sanctuary made a promise not to restrict recreational and commercial fishing practices. Ensure this is maintained in new management plan

Fishing industry supported sanctuary designation

It would not continue to support sanctuary if fishing restrictions are made by SBNMS

Fishery management measures on SBNMS should be made by existing FMC / NMFS processes

SBNMS should look into permitting WW within boundaries of SBNMS

to limit number of boats out there

require an education program before issuing a permit

Fishery regs should be through NEFMC / NMFS process

Single process, single point of contact, limit number of meetings fishermen need to attend, reduce bureaucracy

Coordination is necessary between agencies

Clarification is necessary between NEFMC, NMFS and NMSP on the role of SBNMS in terms of fisheries management and habitat protection

Roles, responsibilities and conflicting obligations need to be clarified

SBNMS needs to clarify resources that require priority protection

SBNMS should not manage species by species but by ecosystem based management

Establish an understanding of what SBNMS is there to protect

There must be a clear vision of what SBNMS is doing

Implement no discharging in SBNMS; review current exemptions

Increase education and public awareness on SBNMS i.e. where is it; what is allowed; what is regulated

If whale watching occurs then include education about SBNMS and give part of profits to benefit education

There needs to be more education and better outreach about what types of fishing occur in SBNMS and about how fish are caught in general

In educating about types of fishing include progress by fishing industry towards environmentally friendly fishing practices

Establish a visitors center on the North Shore, or in Glouc

Get commercial fishing industry to participate actively rather than on an adversarial position

Create a clearing house of information (broad based – from users to biology) for naturalists on whale watch boats and for other educators

This could be on the website

SBNMS could use cooperative research grants to involve fishing industry

Make better efforts to communicate with various user and interest groups to get more people involved in activities related to SBNMS

SBNMS should keep current regs on sand and gravel mining

SBNMS needs to consider how to address emerging issues and uses such as

Wind energy, cables, pipelines

In order to make boundaries of SBNMS more meaningful need to include Jeffreys Ledge

Jeffreys is most important spawning ground for GoM herring

Ecosystem is based on herring as prey, as opposed to SB which is sand lance based

Acts as a buffer for resources on SB when sand lance density is down

Important fall feeding habitat for NA right whale

Vulnerable to same threats of development as SB is such as coastal dev; agricultural runoff; outfalls

Southeastern third of Jeffreys is currently within SBNMS boundaries so current boundary is arbitrary

Use fishermen's data of what exists and areas they go within SBNMS as well as scientific info of important biological areas to locate areas of protection agreeable to all users

Do not increase size of SBNMS until Congress mandates purpose of NMS's and MPA's

Fishermen in favor of MPA's if scientifically proven to have diverse habitat and smallest size possible to be scientifically significant

People who were representing SBNMS during designation said on the record that they would not restrict fishing unless done thru NEFMC and NMFS

SBNMS should work with NEFMC . NMFS to address fishery management issues within SBNMS

Put in system of buoys to show boundaries of SBNMS to help with education and enforcement of existing regs

There must be coordination between NMSP and NMFS on marine mammal and endangered species issues

SBNMS needs on the water enforcement presence that does not rely on other agencies

- Must have a dedicated vessel to on the water enforcement

- Previous arrangements have failed to provide adequate enforcement

- Enforcement necessary or regulations are meaningless

SBNMS needs a system to protect aggregations of species (other the Eg) such as limited area closures

SBNMS needs to work on ways to mitigate entanglement on species other than Eg, such as humpbacks

Primary focus needs to be on enforcement and interpretive education for recreational boaters

Prohibit aquaculture within SBNMS

Host regular classes at interpretive centers on how to approach whales within SBNMS

2 years ago SBNMS started a program to monitor marmam within the sanctuary

- keep that work going and continue to support research on marmam

monitor bottom sediment along with water quality for toxins and pollution

- must know status of this to know health of system

- this is responsibility of SBNMS to know status of site

SBNMS should be repository of research going on within SBNMS

- Clearing house

- Research needs to be accessible

Creation of speed limits needs to be carefully considered, based on existing data on marmam collisions

- Should not be limited to vessel class

Increase funding for research within SBNMS, by sanctuary or others but paid for by SBNMS

Look for cooperative research initiatives where fishermen have ownership of SBNMS

- Look for funding from Congress

- Make greater efforts to involve fishermen in research

Utilize fishermen's knowledge to help identify SCR

- Losing information by not asking fishermen's help

Look at how information from fishermen could be better utilized by SBNMS

- Example is artifacts found by fisherman confused with marmam

No user fees, though possibly worth considering if money goes directly back to the site for management

## Boston Scoping Meeting 10/3/02

Commerce and shipping critical to the economic life of Boston  
Any regulations should take this into account

Complex set of regulations for resources out there  
Role of sanctuary should be redefined to accommodate NMSA

There is a wild west mentality about use of the oceans (e.g. energy industry) to exploit resources not protect  
Need to see a public process and public benefit to any private activity

Private uses of public resources should be monitored so regs are not violated  
There must be strict regs to protect the resources

Regs take into account critical nature of commerce but management system should ensure enforcement of existing regs especially relative to vessel traffic

There needs to be a better definition of marine mammal harassment; current definition is unenforceable

There needs to be some method of enforcement or incentive to assure compliance with regs

There needs to be a neutral enforcement agency that is unbiased involved in enforcing SBNMS regs

Create protected area using scientific data (fish spawning, whale feeding, greatest biodiversity) that would be undisturbed by extractive human activity

If permits or regs established then concerned about impacts to specific / selective users (WW / party boats)

Greater enforcement of existing regs is necessary pertaining to small vessel operators as well as larger boats

No need to formalize WW guidelines or to establish WW permitting process

Designated shipping lanes should remain in place  
No need to establish speed restrictions there

Conditions are fluid within ocean envt – resources move from place to place within SBNMS  
Concerned about speed restrictions throughout sanctuary relative to maritime commerce and shipping  
However, WW industry should take on additional burden if speed restrictions as written in guidelines

Development of new regulations should be scientifically driven

Sanctuary should focus on / highlight research program  
There should be a scientifically designed no take area in sanctuary to provide control site for research

Coordinate sanctuary research with other research  
Leverage other academic and scientific research efforts

There needs to be a monitoring system to prevent ship strikes of marine mammals from all vessels

Protections established for marmam within SBNMS should apply outside also

Research should be an integral part of plan in particular marine mammal research coordinated with other GoM entities

Whale populations are found spatially and temporal, there should be seasonal increases in research and monitoring as well a speed restrictions

There needs to be unbiased research efforts on biodiversity and community structure and human impacts on these

For example bycatch of seabirds, dolphins, fish, turtles

More research needed on water quality in SBNMS

Assess activities of disposal site near boundary

Sediment quality

Effects on benthic invertebrates and other bottom dwelling creatures

Research should not stand alone

It should be used to affect mgmnt decision making

Changes to shipping lanes would create more hazardous situation, especially if lanes moved closer to Cape Anne

Shipping lanes need to be open – this is the means to bring necessary commodities to Boston

Do research first; changes need to be based on real science

Turn WW guidelines into regs so don't have to rely on optional compliance

Look to other ways for enforcement if present methods not working; use new technologies

Keep present boundaries

Establish a permanent research reference control area so that data can be compared to data from open areas

MPR should commit to deadlines and make this process a priority

No future dredging on seafloor

Add invasive species to research that needs to be performed

Work with shipping industry and others to find resolution to ballast water problem and other methods of invasive species introduction

---

Develop a water quality monitoring plan to assess impacts of MWRA outfall and non pt source pollution (nitrogen inputs)

Keep oil / gas pipelines and other such projects out of SBNMS

There needs to be prohibition of human activities that negatively affect biodiversity

Establish education programs with local colleges

Develop linkages with high schools

Make sure outreach is reaching full diversity of communities

People of color, low income, urban, Spanish speaking and other language groups

Don't exclude western part of state in outreach and educational efforts

No changes in fishing regulations within SBNMS

Use best available data in management

Do more cooperative research with fishing industry

Make data on problems within SBNMS more available

"State of the Sanctuary" report doesn't describe the actual condition of SBNMS and problems. It is a marketing piece. Also activities from early years are missing

improve public awareness, more dialogue beyond scoping meetings  
through boating magazines  
through internet, magazines, etc

Ptown exhibit is good but need more attention to get people there

Needs to be more public exhibits in various places around Boston area and north shore

Perform more outreach through schools

Follow through with offers on web page (ex: CD)

Monitor water quality and boat traffic on SBNMS

Concerned about discussions to further restrict fishing in SBNMS

SBNMS cannot protect fish because they are migratory

Statutory authority exists for NEFMC / NMFS to regulate fisheries, maintain existing authorities  
Don't need more regulation coming from SBNMS

This would be a violation of the commitment from the New England congressional delegation

Rules proposed should have scientific backing and sound reasoning – not feel good response

Increase recreational use other than WW (diving, kayaking etc) through public outreach

Enforcement within SBNMS should be done by SBNMS

Partnerships with existing agencies have proven inadequate

Would like to see an enforcement officer / coordinator out on the bank

There is a lack of enforcement of WW boats

SBNMS has seen little opposition to no take marine reserves within SBNMS because fishermen thought they had a commitment that that would not happen

Opposed to any sanctuary proposal to exclude fishing activity entirely or in part

Utilize educational vessels out in SBNMS for outreach, education , research

More enforcement necessary on recreational boaters within SBNMS especially on holidays and weekends

Extend boundary to include all of Jeffrey Ledge

Opposed to SBNMS creating restrictions on anchoring

No evidence that boats significantly alter the seafloor habitat

Tuna fleets use of the bank is limited to 2-3 months period in a year

This is not sustained use so anchoring is intermittent

Not worthwhile to spend federal money to look at issues like recovery rates of ocean bottom from placement of anchors

If there is any affect from anchoring that damage is far outweighed by economic value of fishery and recreational benefits of tuna fishing

No justification for special management of marine mammals within SBNMS compared with outside

If there is then that should be explicitly stated

Place emphasis on water quality monitoring in terms of outfall pipe

Disseminate information to public about impacts of anchoring on bottom when research is done

Needs to be specific goals about how to manage resources and what resources are

SBNMS should take a role in researching predator prey relationships, especially the impact of mid water trawling on whale / tuna migration patterns



Research the effect of MWRA outfall on SBNMS

Needs to be more shared information between stakeholders that utilize SBNMS

See some method of licensing or guidelines regulating WW in SBNMS

There needs to be training of whale watchers on the Bank

There needs to be training of public boaters on the bank regarding interacting with whales

Enter into a comprehensive program working with NEFMC, NMFS and full range of fisheries interests

Come up with a synopsis of ecological functions that take place within SBNMS  
and build comprehensive a marine zoning plan

Tuna industry is strongly opposed to any restriction on vessel speed in SBNMS

Format of public meetings is flawed

Round table process loses something from traditional way of seeking public comment  
Can't hear what everyone else has to say

Marine resources should be a priority of SBNMS

Cultural resources are important but there are many other entities looking out for them

Conservation of biodiversity is the most important thing for SBNMS to focus on

Socio economic / financial analysis necessary to study impacts on fishing communities of any regulations on fishing within SBNMS

Against restrictions on commercial fishing in SBNMS or surrounding areas

Already make effort to fish responsibly

Any action prohibiting or preventing fishing would be a catastrophe to local fishermen and small boats

Many people make a living on SB by fishing, keep them in mind

Gear made safe, spent a lot of money on that

Advocate for comprehensive MP

Allow for sections of sanctuary to recover from impacts

Comm. traffic; fisheries; outfall pipe; fibre optic

Benefits to ecosystem, fisheries and tourism

Sustainable fisheries

Oceans are resource for everyone

Plan needs to reflect hat

Provide for preservation of certain areas

There should be no dragging in SBNMS

Disrupts seafloor

Concerned about water quality in SBNMS

Evidence of bleaching

Mammal protection needs to be strengthened

Assure fishermen have break away lines

Concerned about bycatch and discard of that

Want to see healthy ocean ecosystem

Reserves help preserve biodiversity in large areas and increase fish stocks

SBNMS should close certain areas to fishing to conserve biodiversity

Use selective use of closed areas to protect sanctuary as a whole and to help bring back inshore fisheries

Look at overlapping of current fishing closed areas

Use that area as research area

Fisheries management should be run through NMFS

They have better understanding of the system

SBNMS must preserve biodiversity and marine mammals

Protect the entire system

This needs to be a joint effort with mutual compromises for affected parties

Continue research efforts

If people from NMS have problem with fishermen then they should spend time on their vessels

They do not disrupt the bottom with fixed gear

Certain mobile gear churns the bottom and provides bait and nutrients

SBNMS is a sand bar and is not being disrupted

Nothing out of traps goes back dead

Shutting down areas won't help lobster fisheries because lobsters migrate

Concern about water quality and recovery

Non point source pollution

What is the effect of chlorine from outfall pipe on lobsters?

They drop eggs when exposed to chlorine; star fish are coming up bleached

Concerned about mixed use and dumping of gray water from comm. Whale watching boats

Sanctuary should be used and benefit everyone

Need sustainable solutions

---

Weather patterns change water currents from pipe

Enforceable regs only both new and existing

MWRA is wrong – pumping fresh water from water table

More public info of existence of SBNMS is necessary

Recognize appreciation on behalf of fishing industry to reduce bycatch – taking stuff out is contradictory

Goals of sanctuary should be preservation of undisturbed habitats

Sanctuary is not a sanctuary

- NMSA gives SBNMS power to regulate fisheries

- Sanctuary should coordinate with NEFMC to regulate and define what fishing should be in SBNMS (gear, species, etc)

- Sanctuary should have a vision of how fishing fits into ecosystem based management

- Discussion of fishing regulations should involve fishermen and include socio economic, biological, ecological impacts

Sanctuary lacks baseline knowledge of status of the resources

- Need to establish indices of biological and environmental health

What are the effects of the outfall pipe?

- Too much fresh water and contaminants in water

- Trickle down effect – catastrophe or slow death

Appreciation for public inclusion of fishermen

Thanks to NMS for doing 5 year review and to commitment to public comments

Expand boundary to include all of Jeffreys Ledge

How does SBNMS go about accomplishing new objective (habitat / biodiversity protection)

1. gather pre existing info

2. establish scientific program within SBNMS

3. ascertain primary impacts on habitats and biodiversity

4. everyone should participate in achieving new objectives

there should be no vessel discharge in sanctuary from vessels including restrictions on private boats

- there needs to be enforcement of this

sanctuary needs to consider if they have adequate ability to control; new industrial uses such as cables and wind farms

raise public awareness about the SBNMS and raise public involvement in protection of sanctuary

---

sanctuary reports don't include enough data

- compile preexisting data

- identify data gaps

sanctuary should be monitoring MWRA outfall

- fishermen are offering to take Sanctuary personnel out on their boats

Plymouth Scoping Meeting 10/5/02

Need to recognize multigenerational fishing in SBNMS as a cultural activity; there was not enough emphasis placed on this in SOS

Some level of fishing access needs to be maintained

Need more research on impacts of MWRA outfall

Too many anomalies in 2002

Concern about vessel speed in SBNMS (all vessels)

Establish maximum speed

Particularly as more and more high speed vessels come into SBNMS

Use sanctuary authority to influence outfall sewage treatment

Increase to tertiary treatment

Draw on info from a variety of boats in SBNMS (charter / commercial vessels)

Note the revenue from WW and fishing in SBNMS when considering management measures

No additional fishing closures in SBNMS

Spend federal funding on research dedicated to studying impacts from outfall pipe to return life to the bank

No fishing closures on the bank;

Commitment from gov't in '92 was that there would be no added closures on bank due to SBNMS

Avoid redundancy in agency actions

Communities should seek extra NOAA / non federal monies for research to underlie management decisions

Need more data to drive management

Honor the "promise" made at designation the SBNMS would not regulate fishing

Review legislative record to find evidence of that promise

No no-take reserves at SBNMS

Assure representation of fishing in management process

SBNMS needs to integrate itself into existing fishery management process

Use existing process for any fisheries related actions

Sanctuary should not go it alone with fisheries management measures

There should be no restriction on fishing boat access to SBNMS

Charter boats for hire / WW boats are critical access for non boating public

They cause minimal or no damage

Sanctuary should better enforce existing WW guidelines

---

Make guidelines more stringent  
Sanctuary should be driving force in making GL into regs  
Sanctuary must do outreach and education to educate public on GL and regs

SBNMS should exclude additional development such as cables and wind farms

Closures that limit gear types should be considered (e.g. dragging)

Many sites in SBNMS are not impacted by anchoring or dragging so do not limit access  
Sanctuary should not diverge from existing management process

Consider global scientific literature relative to the effectiveness of closed areas  
There is strong evidence of "spillover" of fish to adjacent areas

There should be limits on vessel speed in SBNMS  
If restrictions occur they must be reasonable  
Nobody seeks to hit whales  
"negatives" with speed limits would outweigh the "positives"

Timing of this meeting not good for fishing public inclusion

SBNMS should consider restocking efforts

What is being done to calculate impact of shipping problem in SBNMS

SBNMS should develop research program that makes use of fishing boats as research platforms  
Benefits to research and fishing community

Research closures could be supported provided that all users are consulted in the process

Sanctuary should compile and integrate existing research before conducting new research  
Create a data base of existing picture  
Conduct gap analysis of information  
Utilize non scientific people out on the bank  
Consider anecdotal advisories

Consider all existing closed areas / management measures before making new regulations  
Management should be "holistic" considering all existing management

Streamline / modify fixed gear to reduce marmam entanglement

Do not close areas for research only

Party boats are critical access for non boating public; sanctuary should place more emphasis on their importance

SBNMS must be more inclusive through advisory committee / working groups process

---

Must be representation from all types of fisheries / gear types to help solve problems

Concerned about outfall pipe; need for more research on impact on fisheries

No closures in SBNMS, area should be open to everyone

No regulations on WW vessels

Area is too big, bigger than the actual bank. Boundaries should be reduced

Opposed to any closures

Outfall pipe impacts need to be addressed

During designation Promise that commercial fisheries would not be regulated by Sanctuary

Need to address shipping impacts on right whales

Believe fishing industry is falsely blamed for right whale deaths, when it is actually shipping

Definition of a sanctuary is that it is a safe place to be

Certain things make SBNMS not a safe place to be for MarMam

For example: fixed gear is implicated in marmam entanglements

SBNMS does not do anything so why does it exist?

Current boundaries should be maintained

More protection necessary to make SBNMS a sanctuary

Science advisory council should be established to look at research program direction

Issues such as outfall pipe impacts and better collection of data

Speed limit needs to be created for all vessels within SBNMS

SBNMS staff needs to be more involved in NEFMC process and ship strike subcommittee

Enforcement is necessary, otherwise regs are moot

SBNMS needs to be more inclusive of general public, not just user groups

Opportunity to take part in process

Improve overall outreach efforts

SBNMS is for all not just extractive users

Outfall pipe processes need to be addressed,

SBNMS needs to take bigger role in determining impacts

for example cleaning process of shocking pipes monitored?

If damage is being done then SBNMS needs to take a role in doing something about that

Speed limits necessary on larger vessels transiting SBNMS

e.g. high speed ferries , freighters

Any activity affecting bottom contours of SBNMS should be better researched

SBNMS should have its own law enforcement

MEP as state agency has no federal jurisdiction

Outfall pipe needs to be addressed

SBNMS needs to be involved in identifying and remedying impacts

Research of MWRA needs to be done by independent objective third party

SBNMS should actively publicize data being collected for MWRA in a way the public can understand

Need more outreach and education to public

Concerned about speed limits in SBNMS, esp. High speed ferries and recreational boaters

SBNMS needs to have own enforcement

No new regulations

No to “marine protected area”

No to marine reserve or no take zone

Fishermen were there before SBNMS, fish keep coming

No to increasing size of SBNMS, if anything decrease size if SBNMS back to original proposal prior to actual designation

Original proposal for SAC to be made up of user groups (i.e. fishing groups)

Bring SAC back to original purpose and include all fishing gear types

“we the users are the endangered species out there”

leave regulations alone

SBNMS should be kept open, already enough controls within SBNMS

If fishermen were hurting fish then fish would be gone

Fishermen are drowning in rules

Want to see more publicity about SBNMS



Make laws that are enforceable

During designation promised not to affect fishermen or whale watchers

Concerned about utility cables and gas pipelines being put into SBNMS

Concerned about access for recreational boaters

Studds was a supporter of fishermen, would not be supportive of what is happening now

Fishermen can go nowhere else to fish besides within SBNMS

Already enough areas closed

Closures don't accomplish anything, just move the problem

Fishing community is part of public – should be compensated for any losses occurring with this process

Review SAC membership – 2 seats for conservation is enough

SBNMS regs need to address impacts outside and review activities outside  
(e.g. wind farm and wave energy proposals at OCNMS)

Multiple factors impact SBNMS

Need to assess big picture context

If put laws in effect, make sure you can enforce them

No new restrictions / regulations

Can't afford the existing ones

Concerned that radical environmentalists want to make SBNMS a marine reserve

If a closure is for research that is different

No certification for WW vessels in SBNMS

SBNMS has public resources, public shouldn't be denied access

No restrictions of service vessels transiting SBNMS (tankers, cruise ships, etc)

SBNMS is over 800 sq miles, can't patrol, too large, would be too expensive to patrol

Want proof that SBNMS cannot withstand current activities occurring there

Maintain allowance to dump crematory ashes there

No restrictions on low flying aircraft (these are usually spotter planes)

SBNMS should have regulation that ships coming into SBNMS notify USCG to reduce collisions with fishing vessels

Too many rules now, no new regulations

Urge Council to look at economic impact of new regs within SBNMS

No exploration of SCR in SBNMS

No closures within SBNMS

Either SBNMS should be a “sanctuary” or say it can’t do its job and go out of existence  
It is currently contributing nothing to ocean management

Research socio economic impacts of closing SBNMS

SBNMS needs to encourage more partnerships  
NGO, academia, involve fishermen  
But work with what is already out there, don’t create new ones

If there should be an economic subsidy for fishermen then parity requires there be an economic subsidy for biologists working in SBNMS

A common goal we all need to work towards is assess the issues and figure out how to fix problems while keeping everyone in business and have SBNMS be a real sanctuary

Environmental groups have put fishermen out of business, changes fishermen have made have never been enough

SAC representation needs to be examined

Re-examine SAC to make larger and more representative of diverse interests

Fishermen are concerned they will be pushed out of SBNMS

Fishermen are concerned about the ecosystem in SBNMS, it is their office

SBNMS should look at partnerships with NGO’s to gather good information (TNC)

There should be a publicized annual review of MP to monitor effectiveness

Fishing community is afraid SBNMS will become a park and SBNMS has the key

SBNMS needs to take an active role in setting example for minimizing environmental impacts within the agency

There need to be more educational programs for non-users to discuss uses of SBNMS  
School forum; public forums

Due to fisheries regs there is already less dragging in SBNMS

Purpose of NMS program is to protect resources

Would like to see SBNMS make decisions based on health of resources first and w/o considering job  
Make decisions for the environment

Increase signage at marinas on impacts to whales of whale watching

Cultural resources should not take priority over natural resources